

CHALLENGES TO COORDINATING THE INSTRUMENTS OF NATIONAL  
POWER

by  
Andrew H. Armstrong

A thesis submitted to Johns Hopkins University in conformity with the requirements for  
the degree of Master of Arts

Baltimore, Maryland  
May, 2019

©2019 Andrew H. Armstrong  
All Rights Reserved

## **Abstract**

*Coordination of power projection capability is a central theme in national strategy, but it presents significant challenges in development. This portfolio answers the question, what are the challenges to coordinating the growing instruments of national power. This portfolio answers this question by identifying the challenges that present themselves in Congress and the executive branch. This portfolio theorizes that the growth in the instruments of national power have led to a degree of decentralized control among US power projection capability that causes distinct challenges to the ability of the executive and congressional branch to plan and build coordinated capability. The basis for the argument is predicated on the theory that the US power projection capability has grown to incorporate a wide range of distinct instruments of national power that are used to meet US security objectives. Within several of the instruments of national power exist a host of executive departments and agencies who have independent control of their instrument and this requires the executive and the congressional branch to apply effective coordination to achieve a synchronized strategy. This portfolio examines the National Security Council's efforts to plan amid a growing number of instruments of power. This growth challenges the structure of the National Security Council because it seeks to apply more decentralized capability towards strategy that requires more coordination. Similarly, this portfolio asserts that Congress is also challenged by the growth of the instruments of national power because it challenges jurisdictional limits of the congressional committees and its ability to affect holistic budgeting and oversight in support of coordinated strategy. The final chapter of this portfolio examines the jurisdiction and budgeting challenges in congress through a case study that focuses on counter terrorism strategy both in response to the 9/11 Commission report and during*

*the rise of the Islamic State to demonstrate how the execution of congressional oversight and budgeting challenge the coordination of the instruments of national power. Thesis Advisor: Dr. Kathryn Hill, thesis reviewers: Professor Sarah Clark and Dr. Robert Haffa.*

This thesis portfolio is dedicated to my wife,  
thank you for the countless hours of support.

I would like to acknowledge the incredible professionalism and expertise  
of the professors at Johns Hopkins University.  
Without their instruction this thesis would not have been possible.

## Table of Contents

Abstract	P. ii
Table of Contents	P. v
<u>Introduction</u>	P. 1
Definition of Terms	
Coordinating Instruments	
Key findings	
<u>Chapter 1. Growth of the Instruments of National Power</u>	P. 12
<u>Chapter 2. Challenges to Coordinating DIMEFIL in the NSC</u>	P. 29
Known Organizational Challenges	
Challenges Presented by the Expansion of DIMEFIL	
<u>Chapter 3. Challenges to Coordinating DIMEFIL in Congress</u>	P. 48
Existing Challenges to Coordinating National Strategy	
Congressional Process and the Synchronization of National Power	
Challenges to Coordinating DIMEFIL Instruments	
Building DIMEFIL Capability and Capacity	
Challenges to Coordination	
<u>Chapter 4. Case Study: Counterterrorism Strategies and Applications</u>	P. 69
Congress in the Post 9/11 Era	
Congress and the Growing Threat of Islamic State	
<u>Conclusion</u>	P. 89
Figure 1	P. 96
Bibliography	P. 97

## **Introduction**

This portfolio explores the topic of the instruments of national power and examines factors that challenge the development of national security strategy both in the executive and congressional branch of government. This portfolio identifies challenges in national government's efforts to coordinate the instruments of national power to affect coherent strategy and efforts to build and employ capability and capacity. This portfolio theorizes that the growth in the instruments of national power have led to a degree of decentralized control among the newer additions to the list of instruments that challenges the ability to coordinate strategy in the executive and congressional branches of government. The United States' instruments of national power have grown in capability and capacity over time. This growth challenges coordination in both the executive and the congressional branch of government. In the executive branch this challenges the structure and coordination capability of the National Security Council as it seeks to coordinate national strategy. Additionally, this presents challenges to the congressional branch of government because the jurisdictional limits of the congressional committees affect holistic oversight and thus the ability to synchronize the funding and authorizations in the development of the instruments of national power.

## **Definition of Key Terms**

This thesis portfolio ties together several concepts that relate to national power projection, the development of national capability, and the creation of national strategy in the US Government. In order to present the thesis, a few terms have to be put into context as they are reoccurring concepts through the four chapters. They are the concepts of instruments of national power, strategy, core capability, national objectives and

coordination. These concepts are foundational in the understanding of how both the executive and congressional branches build capability and formulate strategy, and are essential to understanding the nature of the challenges to the effective coordination of strategy.

*Instruments of National Power.* Instruments of national power are the means to which strategy achieves its ends. They represent the different types of power the government can project abroad. Joint Doctrine Note 1-18 Strategy states that, “The means are the capabilities and resources one can bring to bear in the effort to attain the desired strategic ends.”<sup>1</sup> The instruments of national power are commonly referred to by acronyms that list out a set of distinct capabilities. The acronym DIMEFIL is used to examine the instruments of national power, it stands for the diplomatic, information, military economic, finance, intelligence and law enforcement powers that the US projects to achieve strategic ends. This portfolio illustrates that the concept of instruments of national power are not a fixed set of capabilities but rather they have expanded over time. As the US has further refined its approach to strategy, it has necessitated more distinct instruments to achieve national security objectives.

*Strategy.* Strategy, as a concept for this portfolio, is the linking of national ends, ways, and means. In this framework, strategy involves the ability to effectively make an estimate of the situation, develop a desired end-state (ends), develop the capabilities that will be used to achieve the end-state (means) and designing the ways in which the capabilities will be employed to achieve the end-state (ways).<sup>2</sup> Strategy exists at several

---

<sup>1</sup> Joint Doctrine Note 1-18: Strategy, Joint Chiefs of Staff. 25 April 2018, P. II-5. Web: [https://fas.org/irp/doddir/dod/jdn1\\_18.pdf](https://fas.org/irp/doddir/dod/jdn1_18.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. P. vi.

levels within the executive branch. National strategy for instance, “orchestrates the instruments of national power in support of policy objectives and outlines a broad course of action or guidance statements adopted by the government at the national level in pursuit of national objectives.”<sup>3</sup> National strategy is then used by the executive departments and agencies to develop subordinate strategies, to in turn, link their organic ends, ways, and means to achieve department and agency objectives, and in effect national security objectives. This nesting of department and agency strategy to national strategy is a top down planning approach to strategic employment of national capabilities.

*National Security Objectives.* National security objectives are the end-states that national security strategy seeks to achieve. They are shaped by a much broader concept of *national interest*, which “refers to the well-being of American citizens and American enterprise involved in international relations and affected by political forces beyond the administrative control of the United States government.”<sup>4</sup> The *national interests* are much too broad to plan strategy against. The National Security Strategy Primer published by the National Defense University states that:

National interests should be the primary driver of ends when addressing a security challenge. They also provide the benchmark against which to assess threats to the nation, or opportunities for advancing the nation’s well-being. Yet national interests are generally too broad and amorphous to provide a concrete goal for a specific national security strategy. Strategies that set national interests as their goal run the risk of lacking a clear aim and thus diffusing effort.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. P. vi.

<sup>4</sup> Nuechterlein, Donald E. “United States National Interests in a Changing World.” University Press of Kentucky, 2014. P. 6. ProQuest Ebook Central, <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/jhu/detail.action?docID=1915860>.

<sup>5</sup> National Defense University. “National Security Primer.” The National War College. 2018. P. 10. Web: <https://nwc.ndu.edu/Portals/71/Documents/Publications/NSS-Primer-Final-Ed.pdf?ver=2018-07-26-140012-980>



In order to project power in any coherent way, specific objectives have to be established that are aligned with national interests, therefore *national security objectives* seek to set the favorable conditions through the application of instruments of national power to safeguard national interest.

*Core Capability.* This thesis portfolio uses the term core capability to represent the means available to a department or agency to achieve national security objectives. This term is a generalization of a much more detailed concept such as the core competencies in the Department of Defense. The State Department does not categorize specific core capabilities, but it does state that diplomacy and development are the primary mechanisms that enable the State Department to achieve its objectives.<sup>6</sup> These represent the two functional areas that the State Department and the United States Agency for International Development project abroad. Within the other instruments of the DIMEFIL spectrum there exists tangible capability that is projected abroad that is distinct to that instrument. Core capability for the purpose of this portfolio means the distinct elements of an instrument that are essential to achieving national security objectives.

*Coordination.* The coordination of the instruments of national power towards national security objectives is the primary function of the National Security Council. The National Security Act of 1947 established the National Security Council and it states:

The function of the Council shall be to advise the President with respect to the integration of domestic, foreign, and military policies relating to the national security so as to enable the military services and the other departments and

---

<sup>6</sup> US Department of State. Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review. 2015. P. 8. Web: <https://www.state.gov/documents/organization/267396.pdf>

agencies of the Government to cooperate more effectively in matters involving the national security.<sup>7</sup>

The National Security Council coordinates national strategy by synchronizing the departments and agencies efforts towards national objectives. Joint Doctrine states that: “Each instrument of national power works most effectively when it supports and operates harmoniously with the other instruments of national power... Moreover, at any point in time, one of the instruments is usually playing the principal role in advancing the strategy, while the others are supporting”<sup>8</sup> Coordination implies that the optimal resources are apportioned, and the department and agency objectives are directed towards coordinated ends.

These terms aid in contextualizing the overall thesis and the key findings in each of the four chapters. The definition of each terms helps in the understanding of how a rise in the instruments of national power affects synchronization in the executive and congressional branches as they aim to achieve national security objectives. Additionally, the defined terms help to identify how the challenges to synchronization manifest in national government.

### **Coordinating the Instruments of National Power**

Coordinated strategy implies that the instruments of national power, found in the departments and agencies, are synchronized both within and among the other instruments of power by either deconflicted, coordinated or reinforcing action. The conceptualization

---

<sup>7</sup> National Security Act of 1947. Web: <https://www.dni.gov/index.php/ic-legal-reference-book/national-security-act-of-1947>

<sup>8</sup> Joint Doctrine Note 1-18: Strategy, Joint Chiefs of Staff. 25 April 2018, P. II-8. Web: [https://fas.org/irp/doddir/dod/jdn1\\_18.pdf](https://fas.org/irp/doddir/dod/jdn1_18.pdf)

of the instruments of national power make it easier to comprehend what the component functions should accomplish in strategy, but in execution the application of instruments of national power are not as linear. Synchronization is not directed laterally by the departments and agencies. This function is coordinated by the National Security Council and directed by the authority of the President of the United States.

Within the executive branch the National Security Council is the lead entity for synchronizing national strategy among the departments and agencies. It coordinates policy through the Interagency Policy Committee, the Deputy Committee, the Principal Committee, and up to the National Security Council, ultimately for presidential action. Within the National Security Council there are statute members and non-statute members, which represent the range of instruments of national power all with varying degree of authority for policy coordination within the National Security Council. In execution of national strategy, the executive branch departments and agencies have the authoritative responsibilities to wield their respective instrument of national power to achieve national objectives. It is at the National Security Council level that coherent national strategy is developed and pushed back down to the departments and agencies through presidential policy. The polices direct the right mix among the instruments of national power and the required synchronization efforts that enable the United States to achieve national objectives.

The congressional branch of government plays a very distinct roll in the synchronization of the instruments of national power. The congressional branch has the authoritative responsibility to build capability and capacity of the instruments of national power by authorizing and funding department and agency activity. Synchronization

occurs in the congressional branch by ensuring that the executive branch departments and agencies have the ability to project power. Congress uses the budgeting process and oversight authorities as the mechanisms for coordination. Within the congressional branch the core concepts that relate to instruments of national power and effective synchronization are committee jurisdiction, oversight and the authorization and appropriation process. The divide between the conceptualization of the instruments of national power and their representation among the executive departments and agencies is further exacerbated by asynchronous representation through committee jurisdiction. Committee jurisdiction governs the authorization and appropriation process as well as congressional oversight authority and this has a direct correlation to the development of capability and capacity of departments and agencies to wield the instruments of national power against national security objectives.

## **Key Findings**

This portfolio makes three key findings that support the overall premise: that the growth in the instruments of national power have led to a degree of decentralized control among the newer additions to the list of instruments, and this growth presents challenges in the ability to coordinate strategy in the executive and congressional branches of government. The first key finding asserts that over time the US has expanded the lists of instruments of national power in both concept and in execution. The second key finding asserts that in addition to normative challenges to synchronization, the decentralization of DIMEFIL instruments among several executive departments and agencies challenges the coordination of national strategy in the National Security Council. The third key finding is similar to the second, in that amid the normative challenge to coordinating the

development of department and agency capability in the congressional branch, the growth of DIMEFIL instruments and the requirement to coordinate capability challenges the ability of congress to effectively budget and oversee the holistic DIMEFIL development. The fourth chapter illustrates the third key finding of congressional challenges through two case examples. The first case exemplifies the challenges to coordinating the law enforcement and intelligence powers after September 11, 2001, as Congress sought to restructure in order to better coordinate the instruments of national power. The second case study demonstrates the budgeting and oversight challenges to effective coordination during the rise of ISIL, when a growing asymmetric threat signaled a demand to build and project coordinated DIMEFIL instruments in support of strategy.

The first key finding is that the instruments of national power have grown in conception from pre-World War I to contemporary times. This is the basis for demonstrating the challenges in both the executive and congressional branch. The concept of the instruments of national power is the idea that national strategy uses distinct core capabilities in a synchronized manner to affect national strategy. Through congressional and executive action, departments and agencies wield the instruments of national power to achieve national security objectives. The instruments of national power are a conceptualization of power projection capability. They are conceptual in that the executive branch departments and agencies do not all necessarily represent a 1 to 1 relation with each respective instrument. For instance, the military instrument is controlled by the Department of Defense, but the law enforcement instrument is not consolidated in one department. The Department of Justice and the Department of Homeland Security, both have law enforcement power projection capability, both are

separate departments with independent representation in the National Security Council and both are under different congressional committee jurisdictions. But, both the Department of Justice and the Department of Homeland Security project power abroad.

The second key finding is that the National Security Council's ability to synchronize the instruments of national power is challenged by the decentralization of power among the instruments, because the executive agencies and departments have varying degrees of total authority over the corresponding instrument of national power. The National Security Council has a host of challenges that work against effective synchronization. Chapter two identifies four existential challenges to effective coordination through literature review which are: the bureaucratic nature of the National Security Council, the over reliance on the Department of Defense for power projection, parochialism among the departments and agencies and a tendency to focus on crisis management over effective national strategy. These four challenges are the common themes when examining the challenges to effective coordination. This chapter expands on these four themes by positing that the expansion of the instruments of power have decentralized the newer additions of the DIMEFIL instruments which presents a distinct challenge to coordination. For instance, the Department of Defense is solely responsible for military power, but intelligence powers are spread across 16 different members of the Intelligence Community. In the NSC the Director on National Intelligence is the senior intelligence representative but many of the authorities for intelligence projection are decentralized throughout the department and agencies within the executive branch.

The third key finding pertains to decentralization in the congressional branch. As the instruments of national power have increased, they have created additional challenges

to affect coordinated power projection capability in the congressional branch. This chapter identifies the power dynamic between the executive and the congressional branch, jurisdictional challenges and effective oversight as the baseline challenges to effective synchronization of national strategy in Congress. This portfolio adds to the discourse by asserting that as the instruments of national power have expanded to encompass the DIMEFIL range of core power projection capabilities, the ability of Congress to apply effective oversight and execute the budgeting process is further challenged. This third key finding is illustrated in the fourth chapter through a case study. This case study looks at two events that signaled the need to address the challenges associated with effective projection of coordinated capability in Congress, the 9/11 Commission Report and the rise of ISIL in the 114<sup>th</sup> legislative session. Both cases presented an emergent asymmetric threat that required coordinated power projection across the DIMEFIL spectrum. The case study demonstrates that Congress was able to make gains in coordination capability and address jurisdictional challenges, but it did not implement much of the recommendation of the 9/11 Commission Report. Furthermore, during the 114<sup>th</sup> legislative session ISIL came onto the world stage and Congress was then faced with assessing and building capability and capacity among the departments and agencies with full knowledge of the coordination requirements to affect national strategy. But the activity during the 114<sup>th</sup> legislative session was minimal, and it abdicated much of its oversight authority and ability to affect a coordinated strategy by not passing required authorization bills and passing an omnibus spending bill that reflected previous years spending plans that were developed before the rise of ISIL.

These key findings illustrate a conceptual approach to examining congressional and executive activity as it relates to projecting core capability. The decentralization of the instruments of national power in the executive and congressional branches add challenges to developing national strategy. This study does not evaluate the operational necessity of the diffusion of capability throughout the executive departments and agencies and throughout the congressional committee structure as there is utility in a decentralized approach. The decentralization of core capability does present a list of specific challenges to the both the executive and congressional branch as they seek to project power to achieve national security objectives.



## **Chapter 1: Growth of Instruments of National Power**

The instruments of national power are the tools the United States government uses to achieve national objectives. They encompass a spectrum of specific powers identified by the acronym DIMEFIL (Diplomatic, Information, Military, Economic, Finance, Intelligence, and Law Enforcement.) These instruments are powers that largely manifest in the executive branch departments and agencies. The concept of instruments of national power describes the individual tools that nations uses to project soft and hard power abroad. This concept has evolved by expanding the notion of individual instruments to include a greater range of powers. This chapter asserts that the United States, over time, has increased its conception of instruments of national power to more effectively apply specific national powers in the formulation of national strategy. Additionally, this chapter identifies which executive branch departments and agencies represent the individual components of DIMEFIL instruments. Although the concept of DIMEFIL instruments precisely categorizes distinct capabilities, the instruments of national power are not always represented by a single department or agency. How DIMEFIL instruments manifest in government has grown to be a complex array of powers that manifest among several departments and agencies.

One of the earlier examinations of the instruments of national power was written by political scientist E.H. Carr in his book “The Twenty Years Crisis,” where he examined Soviet and United States international relations before World War II.<sup>9</sup> He

---

<sup>9</sup> Carr, Edward H. *The Twenty Years' Crisis 1919-1939, An Introduction to The Study of International Relations*. London, England. MacMillan & Co. Ltd. 1946. P. 108.

makes reference to specific instruments of power and notes that the projection of instruments of power require a degree of coordination:

Political power in the international sphere may be divided, for purposes of discussion, into three categories: (a) military power, (b) economic power, (c) power over opinion. We shall find, however, that these categories are closely interdependent; and though they are theoretically separable, it is difficult in practice to imagine a country for any length of time possessing one kind of power in isolation from the others. In its essence, power is an indivisible whole.<sup>10</sup>

Carr's early reference to the distinct instruments calls out political power as the sum of military, economic, and power of opinion. The reference of power of opinion is an early conceptualization of the more contemporary understating of the instrument of information and diplomacy. This early examination establishes that power projection, as an activity, is a coordinated effort among component capabilities. Additionally, a central theme to Carr's observation is that coordination among the instruments is implied and an essential part of power projection.

With the end of the World War II, the world rested in a completely different balance of power. The Cold War shifted the understanding of instruments of national power and codified four distinct instruments as the mechanisms for projecting national power. Further expansion on the concept of instruments of national power brought into the lexicon the acronym DIME (Diplomatic, Information, Military and Economic.)<sup>11</sup> The complexities of international affairs made executive branch coordination an essential part of effective power projection. The need to coordinate the instruments of national power

---

<sup>10</sup> Carr, Edward H. *The Twenty Years' Crisis 1919-1939, An Introduction to The Study of International Relations*. London, England. MacMillan & Co. Ltd. 1946. P. 108

<sup>11</sup> Worley, Robert. *Orchestrating the Instruments of Power*. Potomac Books. 2015. P., 225

drove the reorganization of the executive branch with the signing of the National Security Act of 1947. Richard Best notes:

Given continuing worldwide responsibilities in the postwar years that involved active diplomacy, sizable military forces, sophisticated intelligence agencies, in addition to economic assistance in various forms, the United States established organizational mechanisms to analyze the international environment, identify priorities, and recommend appropriate policy options.<sup>12</sup>

The National Security Act of 1947 created the National Security Council (NSC) as the principal body for coordinating the instruments of national power against national security objectives. The NSC and instruments of national power were aligned conceptually to orient strategy and powers on the Russian threat.<sup>13</sup> DIME represented the core capabilities that states used to project power on other states in order to influence relations and achieve objectives.

The nature of US international relations changed again in the post September 11<sup>th</sup> 2001 timeframe. The elevation of the threat of terrorism as a focal point in United States national strategy demonstrated gaps in the concept of DIME as the total components of power projection capability. The traditional instruments of diplomatic, information, military and economic powers were less effective at influencing non-state actors. The asymmetric nature of non-state actors presented a unique set of challenges that necessitated the projection of distinct instruments of national power. The DIME construct is focused more towards state on state interaction and does not translate to the operating environment unique to asymmetric warfare. For instance, military activity when projected

---

<sup>12</sup> Best, Richard. "The National Security Council: An Organizational Assessment." Congressional Research Service. December 2011. P. 1. Web: <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/RL30840.pdf>

<sup>13</sup> Jordan, Taylor, Mazarr; American National Security. Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999.P. 544

against non-state actors, still takes place within in foreign state borders. Additionally, the US may not have direct diplomatic ties with non-state actors. Economic trade agreements and sanctions have little to no direct effect on non-state actors. DIME powers began to show limitations against asymmetric threats.

Power projection had to expand beyond the state on state instruments of power in order to achieve objectives against non-state actors. The US had to incorporate a broader range of capabilities in order for strategy to be effective. This shift elevated financial, intelligence, and law enforcement powers to become conceptually distinct instruments that were capable of projecting influence to achieve national objectives.<sup>14</sup> In its current form, the acronym DIMEFIL represents the conceptual expansion of powers or instruments that a nation can project on foreign entities, both state and non-state, to achieve a desired outcome.<sup>15</sup>

The expansion of instruments of national power beyond DIME to include finance, intelligence and law enforcement is evident in academia as a conceptual framework and exists in national strategy as a model for analyzing power projection capabilities. Because the notion of instruments of power is a conceptual framework, there is contention on what constitutes the range of power projection capabilities and utility of DIMEFIL in various operating environments. But what is thematic throughout the discourse in academia is that the dynamic nature of international affairs has necessitated growth in power projection beyond the traditional DIME construct. In practice, US national strategy has adopted the DIMEFIL model and uses it to articulate core power projection

---

<sup>14</sup> National Strategy For Combating Terrorism, 2006, P.1

<sup>15</sup> Worley, Robert. Orchestrating the Instruments of Power. Potomac Books. 2015. P. 225

capabilities in National Strategy, Counterterrorism Strategy and Department of Defense planning publications.

A host of scholarship contends that the nature of asymmetric threats has necessitated the expansion of DIME to DIMEFIL. Arwood, Mills and Raines detail in an Air force Institute of Technology study that, “As the global environment has become more complex, the DIME construct has evolved accordingly... These additional instruments of national power are a direct result of the increasingly joint, combined, and interagency nature of operations.”<sup>16</sup> Similarly Shellman, Levey and Leonard note in a Violent Intranational Political Conflict and Terrorism (VIPCAT) Research Laboratory study that, “Following the onset of the U.S.’s War on Terrorism and a shift in focus from interstate warfare to intrastate, asymmetric warfare against insurgent groups, the military reconsidered its strategy set when facing such unconventional enemies. The result was DIMEFIL, an expansion of the original DIME concept, specifically designed for counterinsurgency operations.”<sup>17</sup> In more current context, the inclusion of finance, intelligence and law enforcement as distinct instruments of national power has surfaced in evaluative discourse concerning the Islamic State.<sup>18</sup> David Johnson in a Parameters

---

<sup>16</sup> Arwood, Sam; Robert Mills; and Richard Raines. “Operational Art and Strategy in Cyberspace.” Proceedings of the International Conference on Information Warfare & Security, January 2010, 16–22. <http://search.ebscohost.com.proxy1.library.jhu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=tsh&AN=49549137&site=ehost-live&scope=site>

<sup>17</sup> Shellman, Stephen M.; Levey, Brian; Leonard Hans H. “Countering the Adversary: Effective Policies or a DIME a Dozen?” Violent Intranational Political Conflict and Terrorism (VIPCAT) Research Laboratory. College of William and Marry. 2011. P. 6. Web: <http://strategicanalysiseneterprises.com/papers/countering.adversary.hscb.apsa.pdf>

<sup>18</sup> Nagata, Michael, Abbas, Ali; et al. Multi-Method Assessment of ISIL. Strategic Multilayer Assessment (SMA) Periodic Publication. 2014. P. 73. Web: [http://socialscience.net/docs/SMA\\_SOCCENT\\_White.Paper\\_Final\\_Dec2014.pdf](http://socialscience.net/docs/SMA_SOCCENT_White.Paper_Final_Dec2014.pdf)

article states that an evaluation of all DIMEFIL powers in counter-ISIL policy is critical to securing US policy objectives.<sup>19</sup>

Academic discourse on the subject of instruments of national power generally accepts the notion that the operational environment has identified limits to the traditional application of DIME. Dr Oscarson, in an Open NATO Publication, observes that the application of DIME instruments is not effective in both asymmetric warfare and hybrid warfare because the power projected by DIME fails to influence actors that seek to defy traditional methods of state power projection, necessitating the expansion to DIMEFIL.<sup>20</sup> Among asymmetric warfare planners and experts, the notion of DIMEFIL represents the additional means to achieve national objectives, but it is not definitive. The US Army War College notes in its course work:

Besides the traditional DIME elements, the counterterrorist community has added intelligence, legal or law enforcement, and financial to their list of elements of power—giving the acronym MIDLIFE or DIMEFIL. Those are useful tools to consider in the war on terrorism, although the expanded categories of national power have not gained broad acceptance beyond the counterterrorism community.<sup>21</sup>

The US Army War College course on National Security goes on to note that there is no definitively established framework articulating what the list of instruments of national power are, but the “U.S. has embraced this kind of more complex image of national

---

<sup>19</sup> Johnson, David. “Fighting the “Islamic State” The Case for US Ground Forces.” Parameters, US army War College. 2015. P. 16. Web:

[https://ssi.armywarcollege.edu/pubs/parameters/Issues/Spring\\_2015/4\\_Special-Commentary\\_Johnson.pdf](https://ssi.armywarcollege.edu/pubs/parameters/Issues/Spring_2015/4_Special-Commentary_Johnson.pdf)

<sup>20</sup> Oscarson, Katerina. The Effectiveness of DIMEFIL Instruments of Power in the Gray Zone. NATO Open Publication. Volume 1, Number 2. 2017. P. 15-16. Web:

[https://www.academia.edu/32325460/The\\_Effectiveness\\_of\\_DIMEFIL\\_Instruments\\_of\\_Power\\_in\\_the\\_Gray\\_Zone](https://www.academia.edu/32325460/The_Effectiveness_of_DIMEFIL_Instruments_of_Power_in_the_Gray_Zone)

<sup>21</sup> Bartholomees, Boone. Theory of War And Strategy. US Army War College, Guide to National Security Issues. Strategic Studies Institute. 2010. P. 19. Web:

[http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/ssi/guide\\_natsec\\_v1\\_2010.pdf](http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/ssi/guide_natsec_v1_2010.pdf)

power, and a series of formal policy documents have introduced contrasting models of power intended to convey the conclusion that viewed comprehensively national power has multiple and overlapping sources.”<sup>22</sup> DMEFIL therefore represents an articulation of expanded core capabilities geared towards projecting power more effectively in pursuit of national objectives.<sup>23</sup> Although there is academic discourse in the efficacy of DIMEFIL over DIME there is consistent views that the nature of the operating environment challenges the DIME model.

Despite academic discourse, US policy in practice uses DIMEFIL as a framework for articulating the range of US capabilities to affect strategy. This is evident in the language of the 2017 National Security Strategy as it calls out a range of power projection capabilities to include powers across the DIMEFIL spectrum.<sup>24</sup> The 2018 National Counterterrorism Strategy specifically refers to finance, intelligence and law enforcement, as distinct tools essential to achieving counter terrorism strategy:

Counterterrorism efforts must be properly balanced across all instruments of national power and include the efforts of traditional and non-traditional partners. While the United States must retain the ability to strike at terrorism around the globe, non-military tools—such as law enforcement, intelligence, diplomacy, financial measures, stabilization, development, prevention, and intervention and reintegration programs—are also required to prevent and counter terrorism.”<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., p. 143.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., P. 144.

<sup>24</sup> National Security Strategy. 2017. Web: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/NSS-Final-12-18-2017-0905.pdf>

<sup>25</sup> United States Government. National Strategy for Counterterrorism of the United States of America. Office of the President. 2018. P. 11. Web: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/NSCT.pdf>

The 2011 National Terrorism Strategy makes similar distinction, calling out finance, intelligence and law enforcement powers in addition to the mainstays of diplomatic and military tools.

The paradigm for combating terrorism now involves the application of all elements of our national power and influence. Not only do we employ military power, we use diplomatic, financial, intelligence, and law enforcement activities to protect the Homeland and extend our defenses, disrupt terrorist operations, and deprive our enemies of what they need to operate and survive. We have broken old orthodoxies that once confined our counterterrorism efforts primarily to the criminal justice domain.<sup>26</sup>

Additionally, the DIMEFIL framework is used in the most current National Strategy for Homeland Security, as it states, “The United States will use all instruments of national power and influence – diplomatic, information, military, economic, financial, intelligence, and law enforcement – to achieve our goals to prevent and disrupt terrorist attacks; protect the American people, critical infrastructure, and key resources; and respond to and recover from incidents that do occur.”<sup>27</sup> The inclusion of finance intelligence and law enforcement in national strategy articulates the requirement to project a broad range of powers to achieve a range of national security objectives. DIMEFIL is used in the development of strategy and DIMEFIL powers are projected in the execution of national strategy. In academic circles there is contention on the efficacy of DIMEFIL as a framework for describing the means in which the US project national

---

<sup>26</sup> United States Government. National Strategy for Counterterrorism of the United States of America. Office of the President. 2011. P. 1. Web: <https://www.hsdl.org/?view&did=466588>

<sup>27</sup> United States Government. National Strategy for Homeland Security. 2007. P. 13. Web: [https://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/nat\\_strat\\_homelandsecurity\\_2007.pdf](https://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/nat_strat_homelandsecurity_2007.pdf)



power. Ultimately, the instruments of national power are the tools that policy makers use to achieve national objectives and DIMEFIL is an articulated framework.

The addition of finance, intelligence and law enforcement powers presents policy makers with distinct core capabilities to achieve strategic objectives. The expansion of DIME to DIMEFIL calls out specific capabilities that rely on disparate departments and agencies across the federal government to project power. Incorporating the range DIMEFIL instruments into a strategy. The newer additions provide distinct capabilities that are critical to achieving national security objectives.

#### *Growing Financial Power*

The nature of financial power as a distinct instrument of national power incorporates two key concepts. First is the ability to use capital as an instrument of power projection. This differs from economic power as economic power is associated with projecting access to US markets and economic forces through trade agreements and sanctions. Financial power is focused on the strength of the US dollar and the ability to use access to capital as an instrument of national power. The second concept is using financial mechanisms to project influence. This aspect of financial power relates to limiting foreign actors' access to capital, as well as using financial systems and architecture to achieve US security objectives. The principal federal department charged with coordinating financial power towards policy objectives is the US Treasury. The US Treasury states: "Treasury's Office of International Affairs protects and supports US economic prosperity by strengthening the external environment for US growth, preventing and mitigating global financial instability, and managing key global

challenges.”<sup>28</sup> These two concepts detail how distinct actions projected by financial instruments harnessed by the US Department of Treasury are critical to overall US power projection capability.

Using the US dollar as an instrument of national power is foundational to achieving national security objectives. The US dollar is both an asset to be secured and a means to project power. Paul Viotti in his book, “The Dollar and National Security” notes that the “Defense establishments and the armed forces they organize, train, equip and deploy depend upon the security of capital and capital flows.”<sup>29</sup> The policies that influence its values have a direct correlation to the ability to project power and thus directly influence the other instruments of national power. The value of the US dollar is also a leverage tool. Robert Blackwell and Jennifer Harris in their book “War by other means” notes that the US Government used “the prevalence of the US dollar in global finance to shut out what it considered rogue banks. And, using America’s central role in financial markets, US officials also began effectively conscripting banks all over the world into enforcement agents, presenting them with a simple choice: either comply with US sanctions or stop doing business in the US Dollar.”<sup>30</sup> The strength of the dollar and the ability of the US to manipulate access to the dollar is the foundation of financial power.

Financial power has grown to include the ability to influence activity in the international banking and financial sectors. In Juan Zarate’s book, Treasury’s War, he

---

<sup>28</sup> U.S. Department of Treasury. Organizational Structure, About. 2019. Web: <https://www.treasury.gov/about/organizational-structure/offices/Pages/Office-Of-International-Affairs.aspx>

<sup>29</sup> Viotti, Paul. “The Dollar and National Security.” Stanford University Press. 2014. P. XV

<sup>30</sup> Blackwell, Robert & Harris, Jennifer. “War By other means.” Harvard university Press. 2016. P. 197.

details how the Treasury Department was instrumental in the War on Terrorism as it used distinct financial powers against Al Qaeda.

[The Treasury] put at a premium on finding financial trails so that we could understand Al Qaeda's network, disrupt its operations, and constrict its global reach and most strategic and threatening ambitions. Following Al Qaeda's financial footprints became a new discipline and formed the backbone of our efforts to crush the organization and its operations. And to follow these tracks, the United States needed to build a new enterprise that would leverage access of massive amounts of financial data.<sup>31</sup>

Zarate goes on to note how the Treasury projected national financial power on foreign actors by arresting assets.<sup>32</sup> The ability to seize assets independent of other DIME instruments demonstrates a distinct financial power as well as the coordination required through associated law enforcement channels. Correspondingly, the US Department of Treasury brought financial intelligence to the forefront of financial power projection. Complimenting Zarate's account, Rollins and Wyler in a Congressional Research Service report remark how financial power has become a key tool in national counter-terrorism policy.

Many observers have argued that a key tool to combat the confluence of crime and terrorism is to follow their overlapping money trails and apply financial sanctions and heightened regulatory conditions to vulnerable financial sectors. Both types of groups require funds to sustain operations, and such funds often intersect with the formal international banking system.<sup>33</sup>

The ability of the United States to use financial power became more distinct after September 11, 2001. The US leveraged the strength of the dollar in its policies to combat

---

<sup>31</sup> Zarate, Juan. *Treasury's War*. Public Affairs New York. 2013. P. 14.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., P. 7.

<sup>33</sup> Rollins, John & Wyler, Liana. *Terrorism and Transnational Crime: Foreign Policy Issues for Congress*. Congressional Research Service. 2013. P. 23 Web: <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/terror/R41004.pdf>

terrorism. The US used access to the dollar to track financial information in order to detect nefarious activity. The dollar as an instrument of hard power, coopted foreign financial institutions to adopt policies consistent with US objectives. These capabilities are distinct from the other instruments because they relate to projecting access to or the restriction of access to hard currency, but like the other instruments of power, the financial instrument is not independent of the other instruments of national power.

### *Growing Intelligence Power*

The complex dynamic of US threats, allies and the operating environment has developed to the point that projecting intelligence has itself become a distinct instrument of national power. Intelligence power projection differs from information power projection because as instruments they describe very distinct capability sets and in execution the authorities and mechanisms for strategic messaging and projecting information are not retained in the intelligence community. Intelligence as a power, projects capability abroad to collect information that other state and non-state actors actively seek to secure. The information instrument power, with roots in the power of persuasion seeks to project a narrative to influence state and non-state actors through strategic messaging. Intelligence is focused on adversarial capabilities.

Without a functional understanding of the threat and the operating environment, national security policy would be useless. Recent history has demonstrated that intelligence failures can result in misguided policy, and conversely, reliable intelligence has enabled sound policy to achieve its objective. But beyond its internal value as a critical component to the development of national security policy, it is now conceived of as a distinct instrument of power projection.

The US projects access to its intelligence as a core capability. The complexities of the global environment place stress on the finite capabilities of the US intelligence community. This has placed greater emphasis on value of intelligence sharing in order to garner information and access held by foreign intelligence agencies. A study on foreign intelligence sharing noted:

The growth of these transnational threats has impelled intelligence services to cooperate with counterparts in other states in order to meet these challenges. Cooperation between selected Western states and in certain areas of intelligence operations (such as signals intelligence) is longstanding. Since 9/11, however, there has been an exponential increase in both the scope and scale of intelligence cooperation, including that between formerly non-aligned and hostile states.<sup>34</sup>

The idea that sharing access to intelligence in order to affect policy enables the US to project its intelligence capability to get access to information and intelligence means that it needs, but otherwise cannot get. Additionally, states can restrict access to their intelligence as a way to project power. For instance, Britain in 2017, had temporarily restricted its intelligence sharing with the US in response to intelligence sharing that occurred between the United States and Russia.<sup>35</sup> Although information and intelligence sharing has been evidenced throughout history, it is now considered a distinct instrument of national power rather than an enabling function.

---

<sup>34</sup> Born, Hans; Leigh, Ian & Willis, Aidan. "Intelligence Cooperation and Accountability." Routledge. January 2011. P. 3. Web: <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/jhu/reader.action?docID=668167&ppg=16>

<sup>35</sup> Greenwood. Max, "UK resumes intelligence-sharing with US: reports." The Hill. May 2017. Web: <https://thehill.com/policy/national-security/335232-uk-resumes-sharing-intelligence-information-with-us-report>

Another aspect of intelligence projection relates to the ability to collect information on adversarial actions, capability and intent. Lowenthal states in his book “Intelligence, From Policy to Secrets,” that:

Information is needed about [threat] actors, their intentions, their likely actions, and their capabilities in a variety of areas, including economic, military and societal. The United States built its intelligence organizations in recognition of the fact that some of the information it would like to have is either inaccessible or being actively denied. In other words, the information is secret as far as the United States is concerned, and those who have the information would like to keep it that way.<sup>36</sup>

In this very traditional sense, intelligence capability is projected abroad in order to determine what the foreign actors are doing. The US uses intelligence both as a tool to be projected abroad and as an enabling tool to bolster other instruments by creating a clearer picture of the operating environment than is readily available through normal informational channels.

#### *Growing Law Enforcement Power*

The law enforcement instrument is the final addition to the expanded list of instruments. Similar to the other instruments, law enforcement power provides a distinct set of core capabilities that differs from the rest of the DIME instruments. Both the Department of Justice and the Department of Homeland Security as well as others departments and agencies are capable of projecting law enforcement power abroad. For instance, both Department of Justice and the Department of Homeland Security have established counter terrorism as a prioritized strategic goal, this is achieved in large part by conducting activities abroad. This is a shift from domestic rule of law activities,

---

<sup>36</sup> Lowenthal, Mark. *Intelligence, From Secrets to Policy*. Sage Press, 2015. P. 7

because of the requirement to project law enforcement abroad in order to meet the national objectives. For instance the FBI under the Department of Justice has “63 legal attaché offices—commonly known as legats—and more than two dozen smaller sub-offices in key cities around the globe, providing coverage for more than 180 countries, territories, and islands.”<sup>37</sup> The legal attaché program is separate from diplomatic activities because the program gains its authorities from the Department of Justice and is managed by the International Operations Division at FBI Headquarters in Washington, D.C.<sup>38</sup> Similarly the DEA under the Department of Justice projects power outside the borders of the united states to achieve national security objectives. A 2007 audit of DEA foreign activities states that:

In order to combat the highest priority drug trafficking organizations, the DEA must extend its operations to other countries where major drug traffickers live and preside over illegal operations. As a result, the DEA has 751 employees in 59 other countries who work with foreign law enforcement agencies, as well as with other U.S. agencies operating in the international arena, to accomplish its mission.<sup>39</sup>

The Department of Justice details in its strategic audit report that the law enforcement instrument is a critical component to achieving national counter terrorism objectives. Captured in the Department of Justice *FY 17 Annual Plan* is not only the view that the law enforcement provides capability, but evidences the conception that the other

---

<sup>37</sup> Federal Bureau of Investigation. International Operations. About, Leadership and Structure. United States Department of Justice. 2019. Web: <https://www.fbi.gov/about/leadership-and-structure/international-operations>

<sup>38</sup> Ibid.

<sup>39</sup> US Department of Justice. The Drug Enforcement Administration’s International Operations. Office of the Inspector General Audit Division. Audit Report 07-19. 2007. P. i. Web: <https://oig.justice.gov/reports/DEA/a0719/final.pdf>

instruments of national power cannot achieve what the Department of Justice can provide.<sup>40</sup>

Similarly, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) is postured to project power abroad, by adopting a similar focus across a wide range of law enforcement sub-disciplines. The Homeland Security Investigations International Operations Division is “the Department of Homeland Security’s largest investigative presence overseas. Division personnel serve as liaisons to governments and law enforcement agencies across the globe and work side-by-side with foreign law enforcement on HSI investigations overseas.”<sup>41</sup> Shiffman and Hoffman describe the scope of power projection capability of the DHS by noting that:

DHS touches more of the public on a daily basis than any other federal agency. Because of this, DHS has demands placed on it that other interagency actors do not and DHS has benefited from the gained unique insight. The DHS workforce of officers, agents, screeners and sailors engages closely with local officials and law enforcement on a continuous basis. Additionally, thousands of DHS employees work outside the United States, attempting to identify the threats long before they reach our shores. DHS employs more workers outside the U.S. Borders than the State Department – only the DoD has more federal employees overseas.<sup>42</sup>

The DHS and DoJ are positioned throughout the globe in order to project a considerable amount of national law enforcement power in support of national security objectives. The DHS and DoJ have both articulated terrorism as a top priority which focuses law enforcement activities abroad in concert with host nation law enforcement operations.

---

<sup>40</sup> United State Government. U.S. Department of Justice. *FY 2015 Annual Performance Report & FY 2017 Annual Performance Plan*. P. I-14 Web: <https://www.justice.gov/doj/fy-2015-annual-performance-report-fy-2017-annual-performance-plan>

<sup>41</sup> US Department of Homeland Security. *Homeland Security Investigations International Operations*. Who We Are Immigration and Customs Enforcement. 2019. Web: <https://www.ice.gov/international-operations>

<sup>42</sup> George, Roger Z, and Harvey Rishikof. *The National Security Enterprise: Navigating the Labyrinth*. Washington: Georgetown University Press, 2010. P. 219



Both departments have expanded beyond domestic law enforcement roles and project power abroad under the authority of the respective federal agency and in coordination with State Department initiatives.

## **Conclusion**

The evolution of power projection has demonstrated that the instruments of national power have grown over the last century. The conceptualization of the instruments of national power in the period prior to World War II were rooted in military, economic and the power of persuasion. The concept of instruments of national power expanded after WWII to include information and diplomacy and introduced the acronym DIME. In response to the War on Terrorism, the instruments again expanded to include finance, intelligence and law enforcement. The newer additions to the DIMEFIL spectrum are now dispersed through many departments and agencies, who all are independently responsible for projecting the respective instrument of national power. The growth signaled distinct aspects of core capabilities that the United States projects to achieve national security objectives.

## **Chapter 2. NSC Challenges to Coordinating the Instruments of National Power Within the National Security Council**

The National Security Council is the primary government body that is responsible for coordinating national security strategy. Its main function is to coordinate department and agency policies toward achieving overall national level objectives. By design, the National Security Council is charged with overcoming the inherent challenges of coordinating the range of departments and agency policies. The NSC does not write individual department and agency policy, but coordinates the policies towards a comprehensive goal. Though bureaucratic process it makes recommendations to the President on policy options in which the President can then direct department and agency policy through presidential authorities. Therefore, the NSC, inherent to its organizational structure and authorities, experiences challenges that are directly attributed to coordinating the instruments of national power. This chapter identifies the themes throughout scholarship on the challenges to coordination in the NSC and then adds to the discourse by asserting that the expansion of instruments of national power adds to the challenges of effective coordination in the executive branch.

This chapter establishes the second key finding of the thesis portfolio, which is that the conceptual expansion of more distinct instruments requires the incorporation of instrumental power that is decentralized across several departments and agencies and this decentralization challenges effective coordination in the NSC. This key finding is demonstrated through an examination of how the instruments of national power are represented in the National Security Council. As the instruments of national power have grown, their representation in the National Security Council have become more

decentralized because instrumental powers reside across multiple departments and agencies. This adds a layer of complexity because the NSC then has to coordinate instrumental power among several departments and agencies vice just one. This chapter expands off the key finding in chapter one as it looks specifically within the NSC and how expansion of powers affects coordination.

Organizational challenges are not a new focus area in the assessment of the effectiveness of the NSC in developing policy. Scholarship has identified existing organizational challenges that affect the synchronization of instruments of national power. This chapter identifies four common themes when assessing the challenges that directly affect the ability of the NSC to coordinate the instruments of national power. This chapter adds that more distinct instruments of national power that are decentralized among several departments and agencies is an additional challenge to effective coordination. Evaluating the structure NSC through the context of DIMEFIL instruments demonstrates additional challenges and adds the discourse on overall challenges to effective formulation of coordinated strategy in the NSC.

### **Known Organizational Challenges**

The National Security Council is subject to identified coordination challenges when making national strategy. These challenges relate to the structure, authorities and capability of the executive departments and agencies that wield the instruments of national power. Additionally, the structure of the NSC itself presents challenges. George and Rishikof outline in their book “The National Security Enterprise: Navigating the

Labyrinth," four challenges that manifest when coordinating national strategy.<sup>43</sup> These four challenges are: the bureaucratic nature of the NSC, the over reliance on the Department of Defense and the military instrument of national power, parochialism within the executive agencies when coordinating national security policy, and the NSC's fixation on crisis management vice policy synchronization. These challenges are consistent themes among other analysis that relate to the coordination of the instruments of national power within the NSC. The four challenges are more general in nature and have been factors since the inception of the Nation Security Council, but present a consistent theme. They represent a baseline of coordination challenges that affect coordination in the executive branch. The expansion of the instruments of national power as a separately distinct phenomenon stresses these existing challenges. Adding additional capability and capacity as well as additional agency coordination causes stress on the organizational structure of the NSC.

*Bureaucratic Nature of the NSC.* This theme relates most directly to the expansion of the instruments of national power. The NSC, as an organization, has grown in size over time. Richard Best describes, in his historical analysis of the NSC, how the NSC has evolved from a small council of four individuals to its current state as a large bureaucratic organization.<sup>44</sup> With this growth came a range of authorities for coordinating national security policy. Best describes how in each administration, the National Security Council had distinct challenges ranging from the limited authority to ensure coordination

---

<sup>43</sup> George, Roger Z, and Harvey Rishikof. *The National Security Enterprise: Navigating the Labyrinth*. Washington: Georgetown University Press, 2010. P. 5

<sup>44</sup> Best, Richard A. "The National Security Council: An Organizational Assessment." Washington, D.C., Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, 2009, P. 6-7. Web: <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/RL30840.pdf>

of the instruments of power, to the other extreme, where the NSC directed policy and used specific instruments of power independent of presidential authorities.<sup>45</sup> Best's analysis details how in each administration the NSC adapted to meet specific challenges that faced the executive branch, and specifically the organization structure and authorities dictated by the President that either aided to, or was a friction point to, the success of the National Security Council.<sup>46</sup> But ultimately, the organization of the NSC has grown over time and its functions are directed by the President to enable decision-making. George and Rishikof capture the organizational complexities that the National Security Council faces when coordinating the instruments of national power, and how the NSC had evolved from its inception:

What was once a function largely focused on the President, his Secretaries of State and Defense, and his military and intelligence advisors is now spread across virtually every department. So, when senior meetings are held on international topics, the range of agencies will span the foreign and security field but also law enforcement agencies and the Department of Homeland Security (DHS); the Economic departments of Treasury, Commerce, and Agriculture; or the technical fields of the Centers for Disease Control, and Prevention, NASA, or the Office of the Science Advisor.<sup>47</sup>

The expansion of staff and advisors have exposed the National Security Council to organizational dynamics that become inhibitors to effective planning and synchronization. The more instruments there are to coordinate, the harder it is to coordinate them. Kathleen McInnis, in a Congressional Research Service report, describes how the issue of bureaucratic growth becomes polarized between two "camps."

---

<sup>45</sup> Best, Richard A. "The National Security Council: An Organizational Assessment." Washington, D.C., Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, 2009, P. 8 & 19. Web: <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/RL30840.pdf>

<sup>46</sup> Ibid., P. 7-24.

<sup>47</sup> George, Roger Z, and Rishikof, Harvey. The National Security Enterprise: Navigating the Labyrinth. Washington: Georgetown University Press, 2010., P. 5.

The first being that the NSC has grown commensurate with the requirement to synchronize the instruments of national power, thus the large organizational structure is necessary.<sup>48</sup> The other view is that it has grown too much and its influence reaches too far into the synchronization of instruments of national powers at the departmental level.<sup>49</sup>

These observations all illustrate friction points within the structure of the NSC. The first is Best's observation that the structure of the NSC is dictated by the organizational preferences of the President. The second is George and Rishikof's observation that the NSC has to coordinate the instruments of national power across a large body of cabinet staff, and executive agencies and experts. McInnis observes that the large NSC staff focuses on departmental level coordination rather than strategic coordination and alignment of instruments of national power. All show that organizationally the NSC is large and subject to bureaucratic challenges that affect the ability to coordinate national policy.

*The Over Reliance on the Department of Defense.* Many of the instruments of national power are heavily influenced or overshadowed by military power.<sup>50</sup> Strategic planners tend to use military power as a one source solution rather than strategically align all instruments against national security objectives, because it is ready and capable of world-wide projection.<sup>51</sup> The limitations this has on power projection is identified by the Defense Department and is codified in its doctrinal publications: "Military power cannot,

---

<sup>48</sup> McInnis, Cathlene. "Right-Sizing" the National Security Council Staff" CRS Insight, 2016. P. 1-2. Web: <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/IN10521.pdf>

<sup>49</sup> Ibid.

<sup>50</sup> McInnis, Cathlene. "Right-Sizing" the National Security Council Staff" CRS Insight, 2016. P. 1-2. Web: <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/IN10521.pdf>

<sup>51</sup> Ibid.

by itself, restore or guarantee stable peace. It must, however, establish global, regional, and local conditions that allow the other instruments of national power—diplomatic, informational, and economic—to exert their full influence.”<sup>52</sup> Conversely, Gordon Adams observes that the U.S. Military “is the world’s only truly global military force: it could, if needed, deploy to any country, fly in any airspace, sail to any port. It has the only global logistics, infrastructure, transportation, communications and intelligence. Neither the civilian institutions, nor any other country, have equivalent capacity, resources, flexibility or readiness.”<sup>53</sup> Adams notes how the capability of the military provides ready response options for policy makers. George and Rishikof on the other hand detail how other U.S. Departments and agencies responsible for implementing the other instruments do not have ready forces for global contingency operations to the scale of the military.<sup>54</sup>

This theme was also the primary finding of the Atlantic Council Combatant Command Task Force, a study of interagency power projection chaired by Gen. James Jones USMC (Ret.) and former National Security Advisor. The study notes: “The US government currently has only one structure, the geographic combatant command, to execute foreign and defense policy in key regions of the world. At present, there is no mechanisms in place to integrate activities of all US Government department and agencies in key regions.”<sup>55</sup> The theme of Department of Defense primacy in power

---

<sup>52</sup> FM 3-0, Operations, P. 2-1

<sup>53</sup> Adams, Gordon & Murry, Shoon. Mission Creep: The militarization of US foreign Policy; Georgetown University Press; 2014. P. 24.

<sup>54</sup> George, Roger Z, and Harvey Rishikof. The National Security Enterprise: Navigating the Labyrinth. Washington: Georgetown University Press, 2010. P. 5

<sup>55</sup> Jones, James. All Elements of National Power. Atlantic Council. 2014. P.7. Web: [https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/images/publications/All\\_Elements\\_of\\_National\\_Power.pdf](https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/images/publications/All_Elements_of_National_Power.pdf).

projection is seen as an inhibitor to effective synchronization of the instruments across the DIMEFIL spectrum of national power because it does not bring to bear the targeted capabilities of the larger government enterprise.

*Parochialism Within Each of the Executive Agencies.* Parochialism is the opposite of unity of effort. It is defined by the competition among the different departments and agencies as they compete for resources, missions and authorities. This is a challenge because the effect of parochialism drives each department and agency to bolster their own capability and capacity to achieve national objectives rather than taking a secondary or supportive subordinate role to another agency towards a particular national objective. Kim Holmes notes in a Heritage Foundation article that, “[t]he basic problem is that contradictions are built into the very nature of the NSC. On the one hand, it is supposed to be at the service of the President—that is, the President’s principal source of advice. On the other hand, the President’s advisors are also cabinet officials who are in charge of huge operations with their own distinct cultures and interests.”<sup>56</sup> This theme is articulated in many examinations of the NSC and has been a key driver in what is referred to as an “Honest Broker” model developed by Brent Scowcroft and Collin Powell.<sup>57</sup> In Hoffman and Neuhard’s article “Avoiding Strategic Inertia” they examine the theory involving the “honest broker” model to temper agency and department parochialism:

The honest broker serves as a neutral referee between competing cabinet or department views, seeking to refine options, draw out debates, and enhance policy options. Cabinet officers prefer an advisor who avoids taking sides and merely

---

<sup>56</sup> Holmes, Kim. Memo to a New President: How Best to Organize the National Security Council. Heritage Foundation, April 2016. P. 2. Web: <https://www.heritage.org/defense/report/memo-new-president-how-best-organize-the-national-security-council>

<sup>57</sup> Holmes, Kim. Memo to a New President: How Best to Organize the National Security Council. Heritage Foundation, April 2016. P. 4. Web: <https://www.heritage.org/defense/report/memo-new-president-how-best-organize-the-national-security-council>



sets the table for a debate. Others are wary of the advisor's proximity to the Oval Office and independent views. Historically, the job has centered on getting multiple perspectives in front of the council, vetting them, and not letting strong-minded department heads steamroll a premature option isolated from the White House.<sup>58</sup>

The NSC by design creates opportunity for executive agencies to work against each other in order to gain primacy by securing equity in national security policy. It is the role of the NSC Advisor to temper that contest for control by the departments and agencies and advise the President on the right mix of national power projection to achieve national security objectives. The honest broker model, as an example of mitigating strategies, attempts to remedy parochialism by calling objectivity to the forefront in decision making. But it also evidences the existential nature of parochial forces within the NSC, and their effect on coordination of instruments of national power.

*Focus on Crisis Management Vice Strategic Planning.* Crisis certainly affects prioritization of effort. The NSC is no less susceptible to this challenge to coordination. Jordan, Taylor and Mazarr explain how crisis impacts coordination and the policy process in the book "American National Security" by observing that national security decision making process is vastly complex and as the severity of the issues rise, the fewer decision makers are involved in the process. "There are regularized processes for decision making, but the issues themselves and the particular ways they arise often dictate the precise method by which they are addressed."<sup>59</sup> Jordan, Taylor and Mazarr describe policy rings, which are concentric circles of influence surrounding the President,

---

<sup>58</sup> Hoffman, Francis; Neuhard, Ryan. Avoiding Strategic Inertia: Enabling the National Security Council. Foreign Policy Research Institute. 2016. P. 221. Web: [https://www.sciencedirect-com.proxy1.library.jhu.edu/science/article/pii/S0030438716000041](https://www.sciencedirect.com.proxy1.library.jhu.edu/science/article/pii/S0030438716000041)

<sup>59</sup> Jordan, Taylor, Mazarr; American National Security. Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999. P. 219

at the inner circle sits the President, the next circle is the President's advisors, followed by the office and staff of the President, then the executive departments and agencies and finally Congress.<sup>60</sup> Emerging issues, emergencies, analysis and the policy response options can originate within every ring, but ultimately have to make it to the President for decision. Issues that necessitate a national security response are then grouped into routine and priority level categories, "Factors such as secrecy, immediacy, political sensitivity, and seriousness of impact tend to place decisions into either the 'routine' or 'priority' category. Routine decisions generally involve more of the circles of policy making, whereas priority decisions, especially those that require great secrecy and quick action are often made at the inner one or two circles."<sup>61</sup> Jordan, Taylor and Mazarr make a critical observation because as the severity increases and the political sensitivity increases, the policy options and the required coordination are not processed through the structure. There is less analytic rigor focused on coordination among the DIMEFIL spectrum, in an effort to create a response. This is a speed vs accuracy dilemma, and it is existential in the NSC. When the NSC is coordinating the instruments of national power, as the importance and time sensitive nature of requirements grows more effort is focused on crisis management and response and less effort is focused on effective coordination.

These four challenges have an impact on how the instruments of national power are coordinated and describe the nature of the forces that provide friction in coordinating policy to meet national security objectives. The bureaucracy within the NSC and how it affects the decision making process, the over reliance on the Department of Defense to

---

<sup>60</sup> Ibid., P 218

<sup>61</sup> Ibid., P. 219

project power across the DIMEFIL spectrum, the parochialism within the departments and agencies as they seek equity in national security, and speed vs accuracy dilemma that is associated with crisis at the NSC rather than the formulation of comprehensive and coordinated national strategy all affect the way the instruments are used to protect the nation's interests. All of these factors challenge the way that policy is coordinated to form the right mix of DIMEFIL instruments against national objectives. These factors are based on the organizational dynamics of the NSC, and not necessarily dependent on the expansion of the instruments of national power as a primary driver. Although, these four challenges directly contribute to the friction associated with the expansion of instruments of national power, because as the departments and agencies project core instrument capability the NSC has to ensure that it is equitably aligned towards national security objectives.

### **Challenges Presented by the Expansion of DIMEFIL**

The expansion of the instruments of national power adds additional challenges to the coordinating activity in the NSC because of how the instruments are represented in the executive departments and agencies. Representation of the instruments of national power in the NSC manifest in two forms, centralized and decentralized. The levels of decentralization are dependent on the various departments and agencies that are able to project the DIMEFIL capability. Figure 1 shows the general breakdown of DIMEFIL capabilities, and their corresponding representation in the NSC.

The NSC has from its inception been the principal executive council for coordinating the instruments of national power to achieve national security objectives.

The National Security Act of 1947 which created the National Security Council states that:

The function of the Council shall be to advise the President with respect to the integration of domestic, foreign, and military policies relating to the national security so as to enable the military services and the other departments and agencies of the Government to cooperate more effectively in matters involving the national security.<sup>62</sup>

The National Security Council achieves synchronization and coordination of policy by advising the President of policy options and integrating all agency level policies.<sup>63</sup> The NSC does not make department or agency policy nor does it make final decisions on national security strategy, it is an advisory council that is charged with ensuring that the executive agencies policies are nested with the national strategy and advises the President on “policy formulation, oversight of policy implementation, and policy implementation.”<sup>64</sup>

The structure of the NSC does not by statute give equal equity among the departments and agencies that represent the instruments of national power. Through an analysis of the structure of the NSC overlaid with DIMEFIL equities demonstrates which instruments of national power are centralized under one department and which are spread across several departments and agencies. The oldest instruments represented by the Department of State and the Department of Defense have statute member status for example, and the more nascent instruments are advisory or non-statute members.

---

<sup>62</sup> National Security Act 1947, § Chapter 343-101 (1947).

<sup>63</sup> Worley, Robert. *Orchestrating the Instruments of Power*. Potomac Books. 2015. P. 304

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, P. 305.

The NSC as a whole consists of four levels of committee: The National Security Council, The Principal Committee, the Deputy Committee and the Interagency Policy Committee.<sup>65</sup> The executive branch agencies are the principal mechanism for articulating current policy and establishing policy options within each of the hierarchical committees.<sup>66</sup> Within the National Security Council hierarchy, each instrument of national power is not evenly represented across the DIMEFIL spectrum. For instance, within the National Security Council the statutory members are: “The President, Vice President, Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, and Secretary of Energy”<sup>67</sup> The Obama administration, for instance, included non-statutory members to include: “Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, the Assistant to the President and Chief of Staff (Chief of Staff to the President), and the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs (National Security Advisor). The Director of National Intelligence and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, [are included] statutory advisers to the NSC.”<sup>68</sup> The Principal Committee has the same membership as the NSC minus the President and is chaired by the National Security Advisor.<sup>69</sup>

---

<sup>65</sup> Stojanosk, Oliver. *Review of The Process of Making Decisions In The US National Security Policy*. International Scientific Journal. Contemporary Macedonian Defense. 2016. P. 127 -128 Web: <https://web.b.ebscohost.com/abstract?direct=true&profile=ehost&scope=site&authtype=crawler&jrnl=14098199&AN=117703177&h=LinAfwQ%2bulAhGLBbPxBG%2f6TMAJaySpza3n5C2Qv%2bf8LVXbtC6oioL6HMw%2b2NuP0DgF3hhevzBnYMS9RNJuiqCw%3d%3d&crl=f&resultNs=AdminWebAuth&resultLocal=ErrCrlnProfile&crlhashurl=login.aspx%3fdirect%3dtrue%26profile%3dehost%26scope%3dsite%26authtype%3dcrawler%26jrnl%3d14098199%26AN%3d117703177>,

<sup>66</sup> Ibid., 127

<sup>67</sup> US. Government. Presidential Policy Directive -1. Office of the Whitehouse. 2009. Web: <https://fas.org/irp/offdocs/ppd/ppd-1.pdf>

<sup>68</sup> US. Government. Presidential Policy Directive -1. Office of the Whitehouse. 2009. Web: <https://fas.org/irp/offdocs/ppd/ppd-1.pdf>

<sup>69</sup> Ibid.

The Deputy Committee is comprised of deputy level leadership among the represented agencies in the Principal Committee.<sup>70</sup> The Deputy Committee is identified as being highly influential to the process of coordinating national security policy. Wilcox notes: “The NSC [Deputy Committee] remains a lynchpin in the national security policy and execution process.”<sup>71</sup> But, within the higher echelon committees within the NSC the information power is unrepresented and economic power is largely non-statute members and decentralized across several departments. Financial and law enforcement powers are represented by non-statute members and the intelligence power is represented by an advisory member. Therefore, the make-up of the council is not organized with equal equity against the spectrum of power projection capabilities.

The interagency policy committee is the base echelon of committees within the NSC. It is broken into regional and functional policy groups charged with close policy coordination of either regional or functional issues.<sup>72</sup> The Interagency Policy Committee does the bulk of the analysis as Presidential Policy Directive -1 states:

Management of the development and implementation of national security policies by multiple agencies of the United States Government shall be accomplished by the NSC Interagency Policy Committees (NSC/IPC). The NSC/IPC shall be the main day-to-day fora for interagency coordination of national security policy. They shall provide policy analysis for consideration by the more senior committees of the NSC system and ensure timely responses to decisions made by the President.<sup>73</sup>

---

<sup>70</sup> Ibid.

<sup>71</sup> Wilcox, Mark. The National Security Council Deputies Committee Engine of the Policy Process. InterAgency Journal Vol. 5, Issue 1. 2014 P. 30. Web: <http://thesimonscenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/IAJ-5-1-Winter-2014-22-32.pdf>

<sup>72</sup> Worley, Robert. Orchestrating the Instruments of Power. Potomac Books. 2015. P. 312

<sup>73</sup> US. Government. Presidential Policy Directive -1. Office of the Whitehouse. 2009. Web: <https://fas.org/irp/offdocs/ppd/ppd-1.pdf>

When national security policy consideration requires representation from beyond the statutory and non-statutory agencies, the committees can include required representation.<sup>74</sup> Presidential Policy Directive -1 is not aligned towards a one-to-one representation across the DIMEFIL instruments of national power. For instance, there is not a single executive agency for the instrument of information. That authority used to fall on the United States Information Agency (USIA), as the principal agency for controlling strategic communication but it was dissolved in 1999.<sup>75</sup> The instrument of information is now decentralized among many federal agencies housed in the State Department, Department of Defense, and virtually every agency that interfaces with the foreign media or foreign audiences. Information as an instrument of power is vastly decentralized. Other instruments within the DIMEFIL spectrum are aligned with a high degree of fidelity. For instance, the State Department represents the totality of American diplomatic strength and is a statute member of the NSC with representation within each committee in the NSC hierarchy. The Interagency Policy Committee conducts the required analysis. The Deputy Committee prepares decisions for the Principal Committee and the Principal Committee decides what decisions go to the President for decision. Ultimately, the President aided by the National Security Council makes the decisions.

Within this structure, representation of the instruments of national power in the NSC manifest in two forms: centralized representation and decentralized representation. Diplomatic instruments of power are directly represented by the Department of State in

---

<sup>74</sup> Ibid.

<sup>75</sup> Cull, Nicholas. *The Decline and Fall of the United States Information Agency*. Plagrave McMillan. 2012 P. 180. Web: <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/jhu/detail.action?docID=1138374>

concert with United States Agency for International Development by statute.<sup>76</sup>

Additionally, the military instrument is directly represented by the Department of Defense which is the primary entity for planning, coordinating and executing military power by statute.<sup>77</sup> These two instruments are the totality of centralized representation, the rest of the instruments of national power in the DIMEFIL spectrum are decentralized across a number of executive branch agencies with representation inside or outside the NSC. The instruments that are coordinated outside the NSC, imply a lesser degree of coordination within these instruments of power.

The intelligence instrument has an advisory role within the NSC, with authorities resting with the Director of National Intelligence (DNI) as the lead intelligence advisor to the council.<sup>78</sup> Although the DNI is the lead for intelligence policy, the Intelligence Community is decentralized across an enterprise of executive agencies with mission tasking authority for their respective subordinate intelligence agency.<sup>79</sup> Richard Best explains the contention with the authorities of the Director of National Intelligence as the senior executive representing the intelligence community and the intelligence instrument.

While the DNI's authorities are stronger than those that were available to the [Director of Central Intelligence], whether they are sufficient to implement the 2004 intelligence reforms mandated by Congress, it has been argued, will continue to depend on several factors, including the degree to which the authorities themselves are adequate, the DNI's willingness to assert those

---

<sup>76</sup> U.S. Government. 2015 Agency Financial Report. US Department of State. 2015. P.7. Web: <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/249770.pdf>

<sup>77</sup> U.S Government. The National Military Strategy of the United States of America. Joint Chiefs of Staff. 2015. P. i. Web: [https://www.jcs.mil/Portals/36/Documents/Publications/2015\\_National\\_Military\\_Strategy.pdf](https://www.jcs.mil/Portals/36/Documents/Publications/2015_National_Military_Strategy.pdf)

<sup>78</sup> US. Government. Presidential Policy Directive -1. Office of the Whitehouse. 2009. Web: <https://fas.org/irp/offdocs/ppd/ppd-1.pdf>

<sup>79</sup> Intelligence Community, Web <https://www.dni.gov/index.php>



authorities, and the extent to which the DNI receives presidential and congressional support.<sup>80</sup>

The primary authorities granted to the DNI in the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 gave the position power over personnel, budgeting and tasking authority for intelligence assets. But there are limitations to the authority for tasking intelligence assets. The DNI was “authorized to exercise certain collection authorities, statutory authorities did not explicitly address analysis, production, and dissemination authorities.”<sup>81</sup> Therefore the DNI coordinated the projection of intelligence assets by prioritizing national collection requirements. The remaining departments and agencies of the IC have therefore a lot of latitude to direct intelligence operations in support of department and agency objectives. Intelligence within the NSC is one of the more decentralized instruments of national power.

The law enforcement instrument is a decentralized instrument as well and within the NSC it is represented by both the Justice Department and Homeland Security which are non-statute members of the NSC.<sup>82</sup> The technical nuances among the array of law enforcement disciplines is vast. Each federal law enforcement agency projects a law enforcement sub-discipline abroad.

Each agency brings its own “comparative advantage” to support the law enforcement instrument of national power. For example, no federal law enforcement agency is better at investigating threats to the homeland than the Federal Bureau of Investigation, while the U.S. Secret Service is the premier protective agency in the world. And the U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration is

---

<sup>80</sup> Best, Richard. “Director of National Intelligence Statutory Authorities: Status and Proposals.” Congressional Research Service. December 2011. Summary. Web: <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/intel/RL34231.pdf>

<sup>81</sup> Ibid., P. 8.

<sup>82</sup> US. Government. Presidential Policy Directive -1. Office of the Whitehouse. 2009. Web: <https://fas.org/irp/offdocs/ppd/ppd-1.pdf>

a model for domestic and international counter-narcotics operations. Individually and collectively, these and other U.S. law enforcement agencies make powerful contributions to protecting the United States' enduring interests.<sup>83</sup>

Coordinating such a wide array of different law enforcement capabilities among two of the main federal agencies that are capable of projecting core capability demonstrates the decentralized nature of the instrument.

The financial instrument is centralized to a degree because it is represented by the United States Treasury, which is a non-statute member of the NSC.<sup>84</sup> But, it has decentralized vehicles to project power abroad. The decentralized nature of the financial instrument is based on aspects of the financial powers that are tied to organizations both inside the NSC and outside the NSC and the executive branch to include outside entities such as the World Trade Organization and The International Monetary Fund.<sup>85</sup>

The economic instrument is a decentralized instrument represented by a multitude of organizations that can bring economic forces to bear in support of national security objectives. Of the decentralized instruments, economic power falls on the complex end of the decentralized spectrum. Economic Policy is formulated and coordinated in the Economic Policy Committee which is separate from the National Security Council.<sup>86</sup> Some of the agencies and organizations that can direct economic power are: "Department of Commerce, Department of Treasury, [Department of State] and the Export-Import

---

<sup>83</sup> Catipon, Ronnie S. "Law Enforcement as an Instrument of National Power." The Foreign Service Journal. American Foreign Service Association. March 2017. Web: <http://www.afsa.org/law-enforcement-instrument-national-power>

<sup>84</sup> US. Government. Presidential Policy Directive -1. Office of the Whitehouse. 2009. Web: <https://fas.org/irp/offdocs/ppd/ppd-1.pdf>

<sup>85</sup> Worley, Robert. Orchestrating the Instruments of Power. Potomac Books. 2015. P. 312 P. 235-236

<sup>86</sup> U.S Government. National Economic Council (NEC). The Obama White House, Archives. 2016. Web: <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/administration/eop/nec>

Bank.”<sup>87</sup> Additionally, economic power can be projected using non-government agencies and the private sector.<sup>88</sup> In fact, economic policy is directly tied by domestic market forces and domestic market demands.

Lastly, the information instrument is infinitely decentralized. When the USIA was dissolved, the NSC diminished central control of the information instrument. The realities of the information environment have added such a large degree of complexity to the information instrument that centralized control in the NSC may not be possible. Kozloski notes: “Unlike the other three instruments of national power, diplomacy, military and economic, there is no single department chartered to deal specifically with information.”<sup>89</sup>

The DIMEFIL instruments of national power vary widely in terms of control within the executive agencies charged with projecting the respective power. As the NSC seeks to focus national power across the DIMEFIL spectrum, the coordination required becomes increasingly complex as it involves coordinating policy among agencies with direct control of power to agencies with decentralized control of power, and the most complex when involving agencies and organizations which are controlled outside the NSC. Coordinating the instruments of national power to meet national security objectives becomes functionally more complex as certain instruments are spread over multiple agencies with direct authority for their employment.

---

<sup>87</sup> Leonard J. De Francisci. Employing the Economic Instrument of National Power in Unstable Areas. Small Wars Journal. 2011. P. 7-8. Web. <http://smallwarsjournal.com/sites/default/files/874-defrancisci.pdf>

<sup>88</sup> Ibid., P. 8

<sup>89</sup> Kozloski, Robert. The Information Domain as an Element of National Power. Center for Contemporary Conflict, Naval Post Graduate School. 2009. P. 7. Web: <https://www.hsdl.org/?view&did=232244>

## **Conclusion**

This chapter demonstrates that the expansion of the instruments of national power add a level of complexity to the coordination of national security strategy. The structure and function of the NSC was originally designed to coordinate diplomatic and military instruments of national power. The statute members are directed by the National Security act of 1947 to coordinate efforts in the National Security Council. The rest of the instruments of national power are represented by various agencies that attend in the manner that is directed by the President of the United States. Not all agencies are the sole representative of the respective instrument. The instruments of power are retained in either a centralized or decentralized manner or represented by organizations that are outside the scope of the NSC. The capability of the NSC to synchronize agency policy is also affected by longstanding impediments. The bureaucratic nature of the NSC, the over reliance on the military instrument of national power, parochialism within the executive agencies, and the NSC's fixation on crisis management vice policy synchronization all exacerbate the coordination of executive policy within the NSC. As financial, intelligence and law enforcement instruments have become distinctly required to formulate effective policy they have added a level of complexity.

### **Chapter 3: Challenges to Coordinating DIMEFIL in Congress**

Congress plays a distinct role in the coordination of instruments against national security objectives. Congress coordinates national strategy by authorizing department and agency programs and through the appropriation of funding. One of the more critical functions that Congress executes to ensure the effective coordination of the instruments of power is oversight. Through oversight activities Congress determines the effectiveness of department and agency coordination of strategy and determines which programs are in keeping with the authorities bestowed upon them by Congress, which programs are redundant and which programs are effective. Ultimately Congress is responsible for building capability and capacity among the instruments of national power within the executive departments and agencies. Without a firm understanding of the requirement to coordinate strategy and the requirements of the agencies to carry out strategy, Congress cannot build capability.

This chapter presents the third key finding, which is that the expansion of the instruments of national power have presented distinct challenges to developing and executing national strategy in the congressional branch because of committee jurisdictional limits on action in the authorization, appropriation and oversight process. Much like the National Security Council, the congressional committee system, the budgeting and oversight process, and committee jurisdictional limits were originally designed to build capability and capacity among instruments of national power that are centralized in one executive agency like the Department of Defense and the State Department. In this system Congress builds capability and capacity with little emphasis on integrated capability, because the executive branch focuses the integration of

capability in strategy. But as the instruments have expanded, they are also reliant on integrated capability and capacity. Congress's ability to build capability and capacity to achieve national objectives is then challenged by its own internal organizational structure and process. Jurisdictional limits present challenges to coordinating instruments because instruments are developed without systematic consideration of integrated capability and capacity.

There are two distinct factors that limit Congress's ability to synchronize the instruments of national power against national security objectives. The first factor involves jurisdictional challenges inherent in the committee structure. The second factor is an over reliance on unresponsive budgeting processes that does not validate authorizations or appropriations in a coordinated manner commensurate to a synchronized national security strategy. This chapter identifies where jurisdictional challenges and congressional action in budgeting detract from synchronization of the instruments of national power to the National Security Strategy. This chapter begins with congressional process. The budget is one of the primary mechanisms Congress has in shaping national strategy. Through an examination of the committee system and the budgeting process, this chapter will identify how synchronization of the instruments of national power occur and where challenges exist.

Similar to Chapter 2, this chapter identifies existing challenges to coordination through literature review. These three challenges that the literature review identifies establishes a baseline in evaluating the ability of Congress to build coordinated capability and capacity in order to affect strategy among the instruments of national power. These three challenges are the contentious nature between the executive and the congressional

branch, challenges to congressional committee jurisdiction and challenges to oversight. These challenges all affect the ability to coordinate the development of capability and capacity within the executive departments and agencies. These challenges become exacerbated when evaluating individual DIMEFIL instruments because of how they are distributed throughout various committees. The decentralized nature of the intelligence instrument and the law enforcement instrument specifically challenge congress' ability to build coordinated capability and capacity.

### **Existing Challenges to Coordinating National Strategy in the Congressional Branch.**

Congress is subject to challenges in the conduct of coordinating national strategy that are independent from the expansion of the instruments of national power. The existential challenges are prevalent throughout many different sectors of congressional activity, but are crucial to understanding the nature of friction when national security policy is formulated in Congress. There are three primary challenges that relate to Congress's ability to formulate national strategy. The first challenge is the separation of powers and the dynamic between the executive and the congressional branch when formulating power projection capability. The second challenge is the manner in which congressional jurisdiction limits the holistic scope of congressional activity. The third is the role of oversight as a tool to ensure the effective implementation of national strategy. An understanding of existing challenges is critical to establishing a starting point to then further examine how the expanding instruments of national power challenge congressional structure, budgeting and oversight of executive branch in affecting national security strategy.

*The Nature of Power Between the Congressional and the Executive Branch.* The Federalist papers detail the dynamic nature of tensions between the executive branch and the congressional branch. They outline the foundational concepts relating to government control of national security by detailing the nature of the relationship between the executive and the congressional branch. Hamilton states, “The interior structure of the government as that its several constituent parts may, by their mutual relations, be the means of keeping each other in their proper places.”<sup>90</sup> The tensions, inefficiencies and power struggles, as identified by the framers of the constitution, were designed to protect the democracy from congealing power in a single branch. The friction built into the bicameral legislature and the executive branch present significant challenges to synchronizing policy and ensuring its effective and efficient execution. But, that friction is a critical element as it protects against national power being solely controlled by any branch.

George and Rishkof echo this foundational sentiment when explaining the contemporary political environment stating, “[t]hat the enduring struggle between the legislative and executive branches is turbulent and partisan is to be expected. The competing interests clash by design: it is the American way.”<sup>91</sup> The theme of friction is important in the discussion on Congress and national security. As the framers identify, political friction in the national security process is a critical safeguard, but there is a threshold where the friction transcends utility and detracts from effective governance. Friction and inefficiency are implied, necessary and expected. Although friction is

---

<sup>90</sup> Hamilton, Alexander, et al, “Federalist Papers,” *The Floating Press*, 2011, ProQuest Ebook Central, P. 380, Web: <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/jhu/detail.action?docID=870608>

<sup>91</sup> George, Roger and Harvey Rishikof, *The National Security Enterprise: Navigating the Labyrinth*, Arburg, Gerald, Chapter 11: (Washington: Georgetown University Press, 2010) P. 227.



present, Congress still has to overcome the challenges to meet the requirements of its mandate to conduct effective budgeting and oversight critical to the execution of national security strategy. Congress must navigate internal discourse and the enduring struggle between the executive and the legislature and political agendas to build and facilitate a coordinated power projection capability.

To build power projection capability, Congress relies on oversight as a primary tool to control the national security agenda. Walter Oleszek states in his book “Congressional Procedures,” that congressional committees “hold executive officials accountable for the implementation of delegated authority.”<sup>92</sup> Congress uses oversight to ensure that the departments and agencies are adhering to constraints and restraints outlined in a host of legally binding directives aimed at both the office of the President and the executive departments and agencies. Oleszek outlines that the authorities granted to Congress in legislative power, fiscal oversight, and investigative responsibilities ensure that Congress has the ability to check executive action for a range of purposes critical to achieving effective governance.<sup>93</sup> Oleszek states that:

Each of the three overlapping types of oversight – legislative, fiscal, and investigative – aims to fulfill the basic goals or purposes of oversight such as clarifying statutory intent; evaluating program administration and performance; eliminating waste, fraud and abuse and red tape; reviewing whether programs have outlived their usefulness; ensuring that new programs and agencies are administered in a cost effective and economical manner; and correcting executive abuses of authority.<sup>94</sup>

---

<sup>92</sup> Oleszek, Walter J, *Congressional Procedures and the Policy Process*. Eighth Edition. CQ Press, 2011. P. 334.

<sup>93</sup> Ibid., P. 335-336.

<sup>94</sup> Oleszek, Walter J, *Congressional Procedures and the Policy Process*. Eighth Edition. CQ Press, 2011. P.336.

The overlapping types of oversight that Congress uses to steer national security activity achieve a disproportionately small effect compared to the executive branch authorities in steering national security policy.<sup>95</sup> The National Security Council coordinates the national security policy and delivers the National Security Strategy to Congress for consideration to better understand the overarching strategy and to contextualize the resourcing requirements for federal departments and agencies. Congress uses oversight to discover issues and uses the budgeting process to ensure that the executive branch has the delegated authorities and funding to execute the National Security Strategy.<sup>96</sup> The primary vehicle for ensuring that the executive branch departments and agencies are adhering to the strategy and delegated authorities is through effective oversight mechanisms.

The disparity between the power of the Presidency and Congress in contemporary national security tips much of the initiative and authority to the executive branch. The National Security Council and the departments and agencies create the national strategy and agency strategy. Congress tends to be reactive to the initiative of the executive. But current trends were not always indicative of congressional hold on power. President Gerald Ford wrote that, “On some occasions in our Nation's history, the legislative branch became much more powerful on a day to day basis than the executive branch. On the other occasions, the pendulum swung quite the opposite and the executive branch

---

<sup>95</sup>Meese, Edwin, “Who Is Responsible for America's Security?,” *The Heritage Foundation*, 2011, Web. <http://www.heritage.org/the-constitution/report/who-responsible-americas-security>

<sup>96</sup> Lucas, Nathan; McInnis, Kathleen. “The 2015 National Security Strategy: Authorities, Changes, Issues for Congress,” *Congressional Research Service*, April 2016, P. 5, Web: <https://www.hsdl.org/?view&did=791843>

became infinitely more powerful than the legislature.”<sup>97</sup> President Ford notes in his explanation of the dynamics of power sharing that the executive branch tends to act with less congressional involvement in times of imminent threats to national security because: “After all, a global war could not be waged with [535] members of the House and the Senate deciding what ought to be done militarily, diplomatically, or otherwise.”<sup>98</sup> The executive branch develops the National Security Strategy, Congress authorizes and funds the national security strategy and that forms the basis of the distribution of power between the executive and congressional branch. Congress works through committees and the executive works through a hierarchical system with the preponderance of authorities congealed among a few decision makers.

Congress’s tempo in matters of national security is therefore much slower and subjected to decision by committee. From inception it was designed to be contentious as Hamilton outlines in Federalist 51. But, the friction that is built into the process is not only acceptable, but critical, as Oleszek describes in his book *Congressional Procedures and the Policy Process*. The friction implied in sharing power between the executive and congressional branch is not a static phenomenon. As President Ford observed, during different periods in history, power and authorities will ebb and flow between the two branches of government. These notions are critical when establishing a baseline on what effective oversight is, given the turbulent nature of politics in the federal government, this concept invalidates any notion of government being broken because friction exists. Congress navigates the inherent friction and uses its legislative, budgetary and oversight

---

<sup>97</sup> Ford, Gerald R, “Congress, The Presidency and National Security Policy,” *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, vol. 16, no. 2, 1986, P. 200–205. *JSTOR*, Web: [www.jstor.org/stable/40574643](http://www.jstor.org/stable/40574643)

<sup>98</sup> Ford, Gerald R, “Congress, The Presidency and National Security Policy,” *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, vol. 16, no. 2, 1986, P. 200. *JSTOR*, Web: [www.jstor.org/stable/40574643](http://www.jstor.org/stable/40574643)

authorities to ensure that an acceptable delegation of authorities are granted to the executive branch followed by funding. Congress achieves this understanding of what needs to be done through effective oversight.

*Jurisdiction Challenges.* A Council on Foreign Relations report by Kay King titled, “Congress and National Security,” states that Congress ensures that the department and agencies are executing within the confines of delegated authorities and funding.<sup>99</sup> The committees and sub-committees, which conduct executive branch oversight, are issue focused and honed in on specific items pertaining to their jurisdiction and are not structured to coordinate cross jurisdictional matters easily. Kay King’s report calls out the structure of the committee system in Congress as misaligned to meet its oversight requirements.

One shortcoming that all the national security committees share is their outdated structure. Designed during the Cold War era and updated little since then, the committees that handle foreign policy, defense, and intelligence in both chambers are not organized to adequately address the fast-paced, cross-jurisdictional issues of the world today.<sup>100</sup>

Ornstein and Mann compliments Kings observations, in an article titled “When Congress Checks Out.” They describe how even within narrow jurisdictional limits the ability of Congress to implement effective oversight to shape national security policy is minimal: “Congressional oversight of the executive across a range of policies, but especially on foreign and national security policy, has virtually collapsed.... With little or no midcourse corrections in decision-making and implementation, policy has been largely

---

<sup>99</sup> King, Kay, “Congress and National Security,” *Council on Foreign Relations Press*, 2010, P. 15, Web: [https://www.cfr.org/sites/default/files/pdf/2010/11/Congress\\_CSR58.pdf](https://www.cfr.org/sites/default/files/pdf/2010/11/Congress_CSR58.pdf)

<sup>100</sup> Ibid.

adrift.”<sup>101</sup> Clinton, Lewis and Slein, complement both King and Ornstein and Mann positions by noting that numerous committees have equity in national security oversight because Congress is issue focused, vice aligned by department or agency in the executive branch. This causes a great diffusion of authority across the committees, compared to the linear and hierarchical alignment of the executive branch. Clinton, Lewis and Slein explain the misalignment a degree further, stating that in an effort to exert more influence across a misaligned structure, Congress has made itself weaker:

Analyzing variation in political influence across and within agencies reveals that Congress is less influential relative to the White House when more committees are involved. While increasing the number of involved committees may maximize the electoral benefits for members, it may also undercut the ability of Congress as an institution to collectively respond to the actions of the presidency or the bureaucracy.<sup>102</sup>

The way that Congress aligns its committee system and the volume of committees described by Clinton, Lewis and Slein share similar resemblance to Kay Kings assertion that the committee system itself is aligned to an antiquated system focused on Department of Defense and the State Department as the primary instruments of national power projection.

Oleszek explains that the complexity of the national security issues complicates the implementation strategy which causes additional friction. For instance, as intelligence requirements grow to support the other expanded instruments of national power, the complexity of subject matter and its touch points throughout the national security

---

<sup>101</sup> Ornstein, Norman J., and Thomas Mann E., “When Congress Checks Out.” *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 85, no. 6, 2006, P. 68, JSTOR, [www.jstor.org/stable/20032144](http://www.jstor.org/stable/20032144)

<sup>102</sup> Clinton, Joshua D., et al, “Influencing the Bureaucracy: The Irony of Congressional Oversight.” *American Journal of Political Science*, vol. 58, no. 2, 2014, P. 387–401. JSTOR, Web: [www.jstor.org/stable/24363492](http://www.jstor.org/stable/24363492)

enterprise put a lot of responsibility on the associated committees to understand very complex problems and appropriately authorize, resource and evaluate departments and agencies across the spectrum of intelligence capabilities. This is an immensely large and detailed undertaking and there is even more restriction on information sharing due to classified information. Oleszek points out:

Some policy areas are also harder for Congress to oversee. Intelligence and national security issues are prime examples. Congress must conduct most of its intelligence oversight in secret, and the lawmakers who serve on the intelligence committees are subject to an array of restrictions that inhibit the disclosure of sensitive material even to their colleagues, let alone to the media.<sup>103</sup>

The other instruments of national power are not aligned to one congressional committee. With expertise at a premium and the complexity of issues specific to each instrument of power increasing the pressure on the committee system and the requirement of members of Congress and staff to have a deep understanding of national security becomes greater in order to be effective in required legislative activities.

*Oversight of National Security Policy.* Oversight involves the authorities and mechanisms that Congress maintains to hold the executive branch accountable.

Rosenbach and Pertiz observe that: “Oversight is the responsibility of the legislative branch to monitor and indirectly supervise federal programs, agencies, and policies. This authority is rooted in the Constitution's ‘necessary and proper’ clause and the ‘implied powers’ of Congress.”<sup>104</sup> Quantifying a definitive metric on what effective oversight is

---

<sup>103</sup> Oleszek, Walter J, *Congressional Procedures and the Policy Process*, (CQ Press, Eighth Edition, 2011) P. 359.

<sup>104</sup> Rosenbach, Eric & Peritz Aki J. “Congressional Oversight of the Intelligence Community.” Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Harvard Kennedy School. 2009. Web: <https://www.belfercenter.org/publication/congressional-oversight-intelligence-community>

may prove to be difficult. Auerswald and Campbell explain: “Oversight is not easy to quantify because it is a ubiquitous activity that is subsumed in many hearings, meetings, and informal settings whose purposes may be secondary to reviewing program and policy administration.”<sup>105</sup> Oversight is the activity that the congressional committees take in ensuring that the executive branch is adhering to the authorities that have been granted to it by Congress, additionally it is the activity associated with reviewing budget proposals to determine efficacy of executive capability and capacity. Strand, Johnson and Climer detail the primary challenge with congressional oversight: “The Congress is, by nature, reactive rather than proactive. It reacts to public pressures, to the media, to the interest groups, to national emergencies, even to business left unfinished by the previous Congress.”<sup>106</sup> So therefore, effective oversight can achieve its functions while experiencing any form of friction be it organizational, political or informational. It is a matter of clearly articulating ways means and ends, and turning what needs to be done into action. But it is susceptible to forces that control the agenda. Politically charged agenda items have a tendency to draw more congressional oversight than agenda items related to strategy or strategic planning.

The challenges of separation of powers, jurisdiction and oversight on Congress illustrates some of the existing friction encountered when building core capability for executive execution. The friction that Congress encounters relates to the unity of effort among the executive branch and the level in which Congress can exert influence over the executive. Committee jurisdictional challenges further dilute authority because power is

---

<sup>105</sup> Auerswald, David P. & Campbell Colton C., *Congress and the Politics of National Security*, (Cambridge University Press. 2012.) P. 62.

<sup>106</sup> Strand, Johnson and Climer. “Surviving Inside Congress.” Congressional Institute Incorporated. Fifth Edition. 2015. P. 103.

not congealed in one committee, several committees though both houses of Congress share jurisdiction, diffusing power among many bodies. Additionally, jurisdictional limits keep committee focus scoped to confined limits. Lastly oversight, as a mechanism to drive accountability and ensure the efficacy of executive programs, is subject to the limits of jurisdiction and the agenda of oversight tends to be reactive to political pressures that prioritize other matters over agency coordination. These challenges articulate the organizational challenges that relate to congressional action coordinating national strategy. As the expansion of instruments of national power have broadened the power projection capability across several executive departments and agencies, it has added an additional set of challenges to building capability in a coordinated way. The decentralized control of national security instruments across a range of committees has put stress on the effectiveness of the committee system.

### **Congressional Process and the Expansion of DIMEFIL.**

Congress plays a critical role in the synchronization of national power towards national security objectives. Congress is responsible for authorizing government programs and apportioning funding to build capability. Additionally, Congress determines where the instruments of national power manifest in the federal government departments and agencies. Through effective oversight, Congress seeks to understand the requirements that shape the development of the instruments of national power. Oversight also plays a critical role to help lawmakers hold the executive branch accountable in the execution of delegated authorities. As the security environment changes Congress plays a critical role in determining how capability is built commensurate to the threat. The first segment will examine how Congress is affected by coordination challenges. The second



segment will examine how the budgeting process influences national strategy. The two segments demonstrate how the distributed nature of DIMEFIL instruments across several departments and agencies challenges the ability of congress to build coordinated capabilities.

### **Challenges to Coordinating DIMEFIL Instruments.**

Congress's critical function in the development of strategy is authorizing programs and providing resources to build DIMEFIL capability and capacity. Congressional control of the instruments of national power fall on several committees and sub-committees in both the House and Senate. There are standing committees charged with authorizing programs, appropriating committees which determine department and agency spending and budget committees that determine overall spending and revenues, and all have a role in determining capability and capacity of the instruments of national power.<sup>107</sup> Additionally, standing and appropriating committees in both the House and the Senate have the responsibility to ensure that the departments and agencies are adhering to the authorizing and budgeting bills once signed into law through congressional oversight.<sup>108</sup> Through determining what programs are authorized and funded, Congress determines the mix of DIMEFIL capability the executive branch departments and agencies will receive. By authorizing programs and appropriating funds for the entirety of power projection capability, Congress determines where core capability exists within the departments and agencies.

---

<sup>107</sup> Heitshusen, Valerie, "Committee Types and Roles," *Congressional Research Service*, May 2017, P. 1-2, Web: <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/98-241.pdf>

<sup>108</sup> Halchin, Kaiser, "Congressional Oversight," *Congressional Research Service*, Oct 2012, P. 1, Web: <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/97-936.pdf>

Over time the operational environment has become more complex. Instruments of power have expanded. Congress has kept pace with the evolving security environment adding new instruments to provide the right mix to achieve national security objectives. With the growing complexity of the security environment, there has been a greater requirement for more integrated capability, requiring departments and agencies to synchronize the core capability in the projection of power to achieve national security objectives. This in turn places greater emphasis on Congress to build capability and capacity among the departments and agencies in a coordinated manner among other congressional jurisdictions, ensuring the right programs are in the right place. But committee coordination is limited by jurisdictional challenges, and there is little that directs cross jurisdictional coordination. As rule X of the House of Representatives states:

In developing its plan each committee shall, to the maximum extent feasible—consult with other committees that have jurisdiction over the same or related laws, programs, or agencies within its jurisdiction with the objective of ensuring maximum coordination and cooperation among committees when conducting reviews of such laws, programs, or agencies and include in its plan an explanation of steps that have been or will be taken to ensure such coordination and cooperation.<sup>109</sup>

The Senate has no distinct rule granting or emphasizing coordination authority, but it does outline specific jurisdictional bounds for each committee.<sup>110</sup> To effectively synchronize the instruments of national power, Congress must be able to understand holistic requirements and capabilities and how they should be represented in the departments and agencies. Capabilities must be cross leveled in their development

---

<sup>109</sup> House of Representatives, “Rules of the House of Representatives,” Rule X, *114th Congress*, Jan 2015, P. 6, Web: <http://clerk.house.gov/legislative/house-rules.pdf>

<sup>110</sup> United States Senate, “Authorities and Rules of the Senate Committees,” *115th Congress*, 2017, Web: <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CDOC-115sdoc4/pdf/CDOC-115sdoc4.pdf>

towards strategic ends. This will put challenges on the jurisdictional bounds of the committee structure to conduct coordinated committee oversight to determine the right mix of authorizations and appropriations of each DIMEFIL instrument.

### **Building DIMEFIL Capability and Capacity**

In order to understand the congressional budgeting process that builds capability for the National Security Strategy, it is important to understand the nature of authorities in the process of congressional funding and oversight of the national security strategy. Both houses of Congress perform a critical function in setting the national security interests, and ensuring that the government has the means to secure those interests. Much of the emphasis in developing national security strategy is placed on the executive branch. But, the executive branch does not conceive, develop and execute national strategy solely within the confines of its authorities. Through both executive and congressional branch processes, the federal government develops, prioritizes, funds, executes, and oversees national security strategy.

The executive branch through the National Security Council establishes the National Security Strategy. Then, through the President's Budget the executive branch delivers to Congress a proposed cost to programs that it projects will achieve all executive functions of government.<sup>111</sup> Congress then authorizes each individual program by creating authorization bills that go to the executive branch for signature into law.<sup>112</sup> The authorizations create a framework for what is to be funded. The funding bills are

---

<sup>111</sup> Heniff, Lynch, Tollestop, "Introduction to the Federal Budget Process," *Congressional Research Service*, December 2012, P. 10, Web: <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/98-721.pdf>

<sup>112</sup> Ibid. 20.

created by Congress as appropriations bills and signed into law by the President.<sup>113</sup>

Armed with authorizations and funding the executive departments and agencies can carry out their mandated functions.<sup>114</sup> Congress then ensures that the authorizations and appropriations are being carried out appropriately by congressional oversight. Through a periodic review of agency and department authorizations and appropriations, Congress links strategy and budgeting to build DIMEFIL capability.

The executive branch creates the National Security Strategy as a guiding document to articulate national interests, national security goals, and objectives in order to align executive agencies' subordinate strategies; simultaneously, the National Security Strategy also informs Congress of the executive branch's national strategy.<sup>115</sup> Congress's central role in the process is validating the strategy through authorizing agency programs, appropriating funds, and overseeing the agency's execution.<sup>116</sup> The process of developing a strategy, authorizing the programs, and appropriating funds that occurs between the executive and congressional branch is understood in terms of ends, ways and means as Robert Worley notes:

A strategy links ends, ways, and means. That is, the ends of a strategy are the objectives or goals to be achieved, the means include the multitude of resources devoted to achievement of those objectives, and the ways are the methods of organizing and employing those resources to achieve national objectives. Ways are the heart of strategy formulation.<sup>117</sup>

---

<sup>113</sup> Ibid. 20 - 21.

<sup>114</sup> Ibid. 20.

<sup>115</sup> Dale, Catherine, "National Security Strategy: Mandates, Execution to Date, and Issues for Congress," *Congressional Research Service*, August 2013, P. 3, Web: <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/R43174.pdf>

<sup>116</sup> Dolan, Halchin, Garvey, Oleszek, Ginsberg, "Congressional Oversight Manual," *Congressional Research Service*, 2014, P. 2, Web: <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RL30240.pdf>

<sup>117</sup> Worley, Robert, *Orchestrating the Instruments of Power*, (Potomac Books, 2015) P. 89-90

Ends, ways, and means are central pillars in formulating strategy. They highlight the importance of congressional attention on the role of authorizations and appropriations in the formulation and influence of national strategy.

The National Security Strategy is delivered on the same day the executive branch submits its budget to Congress and 150 days after a new president assumes the office.<sup>118</sup>

The budget process follows a basic framework executed annually:

1. Preparation and submission of the budget by the President to Congress.
2. Congressional review of the President's budget and action required on budgetary matters.
3. Execution of budget-related laws by federal departments and agencies.
4. Audits of agency spending.<sup>119</sup>

Steps two and four represent a large preponderance of the control that Congress has over the development of national security.<sup>120</sup> Congress has two critical tools it uses to synchronize the national strategy: authorizations and appropriations. The National Security Strategy and department strategies in this step play an important role as they inform Congress of the national security objectives and department plans and gives context for the following budgeting process to assist in congressional decision making.<sup>121</sup> Congress first authorizes executive agencies and departments to conduct programs by passing authorization bills that first grant the legal authority for activities within each

---

<sup>118</sup> Ibid.

<sup>119</sup> Oleszek, Walter J, *Congressional Procedures and the Policy Process*. Eighth Edition. CQ Press. 2011. P. 47-48

<sup>120</sup> Ibid, P. 48.

<sup>121</sup> Dale, Catherine, "National Security Strategy: Mandates, Execution to Date, and Issues for Congress," *Congressional Research Service*, August 2013, P. 1, Web: <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/R43174.pdf>

agency.<sup>122</sup> Then Congress funds agency programs through appropriation bills, which can take the form of: “(1) annual, also called regular or general; (2) supplemental, to address unexpected contingencies, such as emergency funding for natural disasters; and (3) continuing, often called continuing resolutions (CRs), to provide stop gap funding for agencies that did not receive an annual appropriation by the start of the fiscal year.”<sup>123</sup> Of the 12 regular budgets authorized and appropriated by Congress, four have a direct correlation to national security: Commerce, Justice, Science; Defense; Homeland Security; State and Foreign Operations.<sup>124</sup> The remaining eight regular budgets may have components that tie into national security strategy but not to the degree of the major stake holding budgets. Linking strategic ends with ways, or department and agency programs and capability with funding requires that Congress authorize and appropriate funds with an understanding of how it ties together holistically to ensure that duplication of effort and misaligned resourcing does not occur.

### **Challenges to Coordination**

There are challenges that occur in the authorization and appropriation process. One challenge is the fact that Congress cannot fund coordinated capability for every contingency. There are limits to aggregate congressional spending.<sup>125</sup> Congressional

---

<sup>122</sup> Oleszek, Walter J, *Congressional Procedures and the Policy Process*. Eighth Edition. CQ Press. 2011. P. 48.

<sup>123</sup> Ibid., P. 50.

<sup>124</sup> United States Government, “Alphabetical Listing of Components, Programs, & Initiatives,” *US Department of Justice* June 2017, Web: <https://www.justice.gov/doj/alphabetical-listing-components-programs-initiatives>; US Department of Defense, “A-Z List,” 2017. Web: <https://www.defense.gov/About/Military-Departments/A-Z-List/>; US Department of Homeland Security, “Operational and Support Components,” June 2017. Web: <https://www.dhs.gov/operational-and-support-components>; US Department of State, “Alphabetical List of Bureaus and Offices,” 2017. Web: <https://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/rls/dos/1718.htm>

<sup>125</sup> National Priorities Project, “Budget Process: Federal Budget 101,” *Institute for Policy Studies*, Web: <https://www.nationalpriorities.org/budget-basics/federal-budget-101/federal-budget-process/>

authorizations further define what the departments and agencies may receive funding for. Congressional appropriations continue to narrow strategic capability to the limits of available funding. When the budget is signed into law, the national security means become finite, which in turn scopes ends and ways. All contingencies and capabilities that fell outside of budgeting remain conceptual and are considered acceptable risk in their absence. Schanzer, Eyerman and de Rugy summarize the challenge of the budgeting process and risk as it pertains to providing capability.

On the one hand, we face large scale risks of successful attacks causing catastrophic damage, but on the other, the government and our political leaders feel responsible for taking “every possible measure” to protect the public. In a world of constrained resources, however, choices must be made and much potential harm must be left unaddressed. Deciding how much of our societal resources to dedicate to [national] security and how to allocate those resources across the myriad of [national] security domains is an exceptionally difficult public policy problem.<sup>126</sup>

Through each step of the congressional budget process, congressional budgeting committees, standing committees, and appropriating committees iteratively scope capability based on resources available. This emphasizes the importance of congressional responsiveness to authorizations. As the national strategies and objectives change, Congress must keep pace with the authorized programs to terminate outdated department and agency programs and authorize new programs to respond to evolving threats.

Congress mitigates the risk of unauthorized or unappropriated contingencies by allowing the use of Overseas Contingency Operations /Global War on Terrorism

---

<sup>126</sup> Schanzer, Eyerman, de Rugy, “Strategic Risk Management in Government: A Look at Homeland Security,” *IBM Center for the Business of Government*, 2009, Web: [https://www.mercatus.org/system/files/Applying\\_Strategic\\_Risk\\_Management\\_to\\_Allocating\\_Resources\\_for\\_Homeland\\_Security.pdf](https://www.mercatus.org/system/files/Applying_Strategic_Risk_Management_to_Allocating_Resources_for_Homeland_Security.pdf).

Funding. This funding gives discretionary funding to the State Department and Department of Defense to fund certain contingencies that fall within prescribed guidelines and outside of authorized and appropriated budgets.<sup>127</sup>

Another challenge is the inherent complexity of congressional control of the budget, and how the committee systems are aligned towards executive branch agencies. Dale, Sarafino and Towell state in a 2013 Congressional Research Service report that, “The current system does not budget for national security in an explicit and bounded way. There is no legal definition stating how “national security” maps onto any of the sets of boundaries used in the current budget process—including executive branch agencies, appropriations subcommittees, or budget functions.”<sup>128</sup> Multiple executive agencies report to multiple committees with differing authorities, and there is no clear alignment of national security equity among congressional committees. The decentralization of national security authorities among the various committees funds the national security enterprise from the bottom up. Each committee steers the executive agencies in a non-synchronized approach, ardently adhering to the limits of its jurisdiction with less attention to holistic prioritization and operational significance. As Dale, Sarafino and Towell further state the current congressional system focused more on “ensuring the internal consistency of each agency’s budget request than at reconciling the requests of various agencies.”<sup>129</sup> The authorization appropriation process does little to look how

---

<sup>127</sup> McGarry, Brandon and Epstein, Susan. “Overseas Contingency Operations Funding: Background and Status,” Congressional Research Service. <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/R44519.pdf>

<sup>128</sup> Dale, Sarafino and Towell, “A Unified National Security Budget? Issues for Congress,” *Congressional Research Service*, March 2013, P. 3, Web: <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/R42997.pdf>

<sup>129</sup> Dale, Sarafino and Towell, “A Unified National Security Budget? Issues for Congress,” *Congressional Research Service*, March 2013, P. 3, Web: <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/R42997.pdf>



division of labor within national security instruments is apportioned within executive agencies.<sup>130</sup>

## **Conclusion**

Congressional control of the synchronization of the DIMEFIL instruments relies heavily on the committee system to conduct detailed analysis of the requirements to build power projection capability. The committees are focused on jurisdictional requirements and there is less emphasis on cross jurisdictional coordination to synchronize authorizations and appropriations. Understanding how to build diplomatic capability depends on the strength of the other instruments. The budgeting process is by its nature a synchronizing event because it apportions finite resources based on prioritization of needs. Congress has the ability to be responsive to the threat environment and department and agency requirements by evaluation and passing twelve authorization and appropriations bills. On the other end of the responsiveness spectrum is continuing resolutions, which apportion funding to fill limited gaps. Committee jurisdictional challenges and unresponsive budgeting limit the ability of Congress to synchronize the instruments of national power.

---

<sup>130</sup> Ibid, P. 4.

## **Chapter 4: Case Study: Counterterrorism Strategies and Applications.**

This Chapter demonstrates through case study that the budgeting cycle and jurisdictional limits of congressional oversight limit the development of coordinated DIMEFIL capability in Congress. This case example examines the congressional role in the synchronization of national power in order to combat terrorism as it became a significant threat to national security, requiring a coordinated effort among the many instruments of national power after September 11<sup>th</sup> 2001. This chapter will also examine the rise of ISIL during 114<sup>th</sup> legislative session (2015 – 2016) and the subsequent congressional action through budgeting and oversight that highlights how the budgeting process degraded the capability to execute national strategy.

The United States shifted its focus from combating al Qaeda, as the eminent asymmetric threat, to including the defeat of the Islamic State terrorist organization to the objectives critical to national security. Congress analyzed the threat and understood the direction that needed to be taken to synchronize resources against a new counterterrorism effort. The lessons learned from the 9/11 Commission Report detailed recommendations to better achieve its national security objectives. This case study details how Congress reacted to the 9/11 Commission Report recommendations to shore up coordinated power projection capability as well as Congress's reaction to rise of a new asymmetric threat. This case study highlights how congressional challenges in jurisdiction, committee oversight and the budgeting process limited its ability to effectively synchronize the instruments of national power.

### **Congress in the Post 9/11 Era.**

Counterterrorism became a central theme in National Security Strategy after the 9/11 attacks. In turn, the organization of Congress and its management and oversight of the execution of national strategy was examined and adjusted to better ensure the instruments of national power could be harnessed and projected to safeguard America's interest at home and abroad. Congress, in the wake of the terrorist attacks, promulgated two significant reorganizations within government that were signed into law as a result of the demand to reorganize and synchronize the instruments of national power. The Homeland Security Act of 2002 centralized many of the federal law enforcement agencies under one cabinet position: the Director of Homeland Security.<sup>131</sup> The Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 created the Director of National Intelligence within the executive branch and centralized a number of authorities that were previously distributed throughout the IC, namely the authority to establish intelligence community budgeting and policy.<sup>132</sup> Congressional action was focused in this time period on analyzing the structure of government and what instruments of national power needed to be further synchronized within the executive branch in order to establish and execute an effective counterterrorism strategy and minimize gaps in intelligence and law enforcement synchronization with the other instruments of national power.

The 9/11 Commission Report was one of the primary documents analyzing necessary governmental reforms to safeguard against future attacks. After the September 11<sup>th</sup> 2001 attack on the United States, Congress mandated that a report be conducted to

---

<sup>131</sup> United States of America, "Homeland Security Act 2002," November 2002, Web: [https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/hr\\_5005\\_enr.pdf](https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/hr_5005_enr.pdf)

<sup>132</sup> United States of America, "Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004," *Government Printing Office*, December 2004, Web: <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/PLAW-108publ458/pdf/PLAW-108publ458.pdf>

determine how a terrorist organization was able to attack the United States with such devastating effects. The result of the commissions finding were delivered in July of 2004.<sup>133</sup> The 9/11 Commission Report highlighted the significance of synchronizing the instruments of national power in both the congressional and executive branch, specifically when formulating a counterterrorism strategy. The 9/11 Commission Report stated:

We need to design a balanced strategy for the long haul, to attack terrorists and prevent their ranks from swelling while at the same time protecting our country against future attacks. We have been forced to think about the way our government is organized. The massive departments and agencies that prevailed in the great struggles of the twentieth century must work together in new ways, so that all the instruments of national power can be combined. Congress needs dramatic change as well to strengthen oversight and focus accountability.<sup>134</sup>

The report highlighted the fact that the executive branch had a tremendously large capability to project an effective counterterrorism strategy, yet it was not synchronized and the result was several independent actions not aligned towards a whole. The same was noted of Congress. The committee system was focused on specific programmatic aspects of the executive agencies and departments in the budgeting and oversight processes with less emphasis on synchronization across committees when exercising congressional control of national strategy.

The 9/11 Commission Report called out specific recommendations that Congress needed to address in order to better focus the legislative functions on national security. The theme of the segment titled “Unity of Effort in Congress” details inefficiencies

---

<sup>133</sup> Pearl, Raphael, “U.S. Anti-Terror Strategy and the 9/11 Commission Report,” *Congressional Research Service*, February 2005, P. I, Web: <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/terror/RL32522.pdf>

<sup>134</sup> Kean, Thomas, et al, “9/11 Commission Report,” National Commission on Terrorist Attacks, 2004, P. XVI, Web: <https://www.9-11commission.gov/report/911Report.pdf>

centered on the intelligence instrument of national power and how its control and synchronization are mismanaged through congressional action in the committee system, stating:

Of all our recommendations, strengthening congressional oversight may be among the most difficult and important. So long as oversight is governed by current congressional rules and resolutions, we believe the American people will not get the security they want and need. The United States needs a strong, stable, and capable congressional committee structure to give America's national intelligence agencies oversight, support, and leadership.<sup>135</sup>

The direct recommendation to Congress was to strengthen intelligence oversight through a joint committee or single committees in the House and Senate and grant them both authorization and appropriating authorities.<sup>136</sup> The 9/11 Commission Report also recommended that the intelligence committees have a separate subcommittee focused exclusively on oversight and is “freed from the consuming responsibility of working on the budget.”<sup>137</sup> In an effort to better synchronize the other instruments of national power with the intelligence instrument, the 9/11 Commission Report recommended that Congress ensure that committee members from the “Armed Services, Judiciary, Foreign Affairs, and the Defense Appropriations subcommittee” are included as members of the intelligence committees.<sup>138</sup> These notions of centralizing authority to the intelligence instrument in Congress, as well as an overall focus on better synchronization of the instruments of national power, were expressed by the report to be instrumental in shoring up congressional function in development and management of national security in

---

<sup>135</sup> Kean, Thomas, et al, “9/11 Commission Report,” *National Commission on Terrorist Attacks*, 2004, P. 419, Web: <https://www.9-11commission.gov/report/911Report.pdf>

<sup>136</sup> Ibid, P. 420.

<sup>137</sup> Ibid, P. 421.

<sup>138</sup> Kean, Thomas, et al, “9/11 Commission Report,” *National Commission on Terrorist Attacks*, 2004, P. 421, Web: <https://www.9-11commission.gov/report/911Report.pdf>

Congress. Creating cross committee membership was seen as an effort to synchronize the intelligence capability with other instruments of power.

The result was some forward progress in Congress as the committee structure was aligned towards jurisdictional control of the newly formed Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and Director of National Intelligence (DNI). This change made some steps towards the centralization of law enforcement and intelligence, and enabled modest gains towards more comprehensive control of the two elements in the execution of national security strategy in both the executive and the congressional branch. After the Homeland Security Act of 2002 and the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, the executive branch had more instruments aligned in cabinet positions, but Congress had to follow suit. Previously, the law enforcement and intelligence instruments were federated among many agencies, and the authorizations of programs and appropriation of funds were even more distributed in Congress before the establishment of the DNI and DHS in the executive and the respective committee's in Congress.

In 2002, Congress began to reorganize the committee structure to reflect the new DHS executive structure. The House established the Select Committee on Homeland Security to establish committee jurisdiction over the newly created DHS in the executive branch.<sup>139</sup> The Select Committee on Homeland Security would be elevated to a standing committee in 2005.<sup>140</sup> In the Senate, the current Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Senate Committee established jurisdiction over DHS in 2003, to ensure “primary

---

<sup>139</sup> House of Representatives, “House Resolution 449,” June 2002, Web: <https://www.congress.gov/bill/107th-congress/house-resolution/449/text>

<sup>140</sup> History, Art & Archives, “The Committee on Homeland Security,” U.S. House of Representatives 2017, Web: <http://history.house.gov/HistoricalHighlight/Detail/37117>

oversight of the creation and subsequent policies, operations, and actions” of DHS.<sup>141</sup>

But, synchronization within instruments was not complete across the evolving law enforcement instrument. For instance, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) remained part of the Justice Department and additionally, the FBI is one of the 17 members of the Intelligence Community with some overlapping policies established by the DNI and outside the jurisdiction of the DHS aligned committees.<sup>142</sup>

The consolidation of intelligence instruments through the creation of the DNI in the executive branch saw little commensurate consolidation within the intelligence instrument in the congressional branch. The recommendations expressed in the 9/11 Commission Report for consolidation of power in either a joint intelligence committee or greater oversight authorities in existing House and Senate committees gained little traction in the years after the 9/11 report. Several attempts were made in Congress to centralize authorities in both houses’ congressional committees. The most significant attempts to reform the intelligence committees’ ability to conduct oversight of executive intelligence functions included legislative attempts to:

1. Clarify and expand the authority of the Government Accountability Office (GAO) over the intelligence community (IC), particularly the CIA.
2. Add a new statutory inspector general (IG) to encompass the whole IC.
3. Create new statutory IGs for certain Defense Department intelligence agencies.

---

<sup>141</sup> U.S. Senate Committee on Homeland Security & Governmental Affairs, “History,” 2017, Web: <https://www.hsgac.senate.gov/about/history>

<sup>142</sup> United States Intelligence Community, “Member Agencies,” 2017, Web: <https://www.intelligencecareers.gov/icmembers.html>

4. Increase coordination and strengthen reporting among the relevant offices of inspector general.

5. Change IC congressional notification and reporting requirements.<sup>143</sup>

None of these changes were enacted. Any bill strengthening congressional control of the budgeting process or oversight of any intelligence function beyond what was currently in place in the 2001 to 2010 timeframe was going to receive a Presidential veto, because it sought to bolster congressional authority over the executive branch.<sup>144</sup> The post September 11th period of reforms remained minimal for the intelligence committees in the House and Senate and the authorities of intelligence budgeting concentrated to a degree in the DNI, but oversight remained widely distributed across the various other stake holding standing committees. Kiaser and Halchin noted in a Congressional Research Service Report in 2012 that:

Most of the jurisdiction of the current Intelligence Committees is shared. The select committees hold exclusive authorizing and legislative powers only for the CIA, the DNI (as it had over the now-defunct Director of Central Intelligence), and the National Foreign Intelligence Program. This leaves the intelligence components in the Departments of Defense, Homeland Security, Justice, and Treasury, among other agencies, and intelligence-related programs to be shared with appropriate standing committees.<sup>145</sup>

After the 9/11 Commission Report, the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence did not incorporate nearly

---

<sup>143</sup> Kaiser, Frederick and Halchin, Elaine, "Congressional Oversight of Intelligence: Current Structure and Alternatives," *Congressional Research Service*, May 2012, P. 4, Web.

<https://fas.org/sgp/crs/intel/RL32525.pdf>

<sup>144</sup> Ibid.

<sup>145</sup> Kaiser, Frederick and Halchin, Elaine, "Congressional Oversight of Intelligence: Current Structure and Alternatives," *Congressional Research Service*, May 2012, P. 4, Web.

<https://fas.org/sgp/crs/intel/RL32525.pdf>



any of the recommendations that enabled a more comprehensive system of controls for the intelligence instrument beyond jurisdiction over the newly created DNI.

Congressional reforms to control the instruments of national power in the years after the 9/11 Commission Report recommendations were minimal. The committee structure and jurisdictional limitations reinforced a system in Congress where committees were largely limited to influencing only specific initiatives within each instrument and confined to committee jurisdiction. Although the 9/11 Commission Report had detailed the importance of synchronization across the array of the instruments of national power, little traction was made to institute substantive measures to control the cross-committee coordination, beyond ensuring the certain committee members were included in the make-up of other committees. This stagnation in Congress to enact essential reforms was identified in a 2008 Project on National Security Reform report as a primary obstacle in the effective synchronization of the instruments of national power in the execution of national security strategy:

Congress focuses almost exclusively on department and agency capabilities instead of what might be particularly relevant to multi-agency activities. Similarly, administration submissions of agency budgets do not focus on interagency missions, nor do they even typically note these requirements. This contrasts sharply with agency-specific needs, which are routinely highlighted in congressional testimony and which are noted as shortfalls in the president's budget. Congress has no clearly assigned venue for oversight for the “interagency” space. The appropriations committees could theoretically take a whole-of-government approach to multi-agency activities, but they typically act with a subcommittee focus. Congress spends enormous amounts of time and effort considering the performance of the individual agencies and departments,

but not broader national security missions more generally nor interagency efforts in particular.<sup>146</sup>

Years after the 9/11 terrorist attacks on the United States and after several comprehensive reviews of Congress' ability to effectively lead the national security effort on the hill have signaled very consistent themes. The committee structure did adjust to DHS requirements but did not align overall law enforcement powers and it did not adjust to the requirement for interagency synchronization. The congressional control of intelligence did make some modest gains in terms of mandating some intelligence sharing, but it did not enact the bulk of what the 9/11 Commission Report suggested. This continued the congressional budgeting and oversight focus of myopic initiatives within each committee. In terms of synchronization, the congressional committee system, in an effort to provide congressional influence, presented challenges to the oversight of coordinated capability of each instrument by congealing jurisdiction in a stove pipe and this offered little roads to synchronization with other instruments of national power.

### **Congress and the Growing Threat of Islamic State**

In January of 2014, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence received the Worldwide Threat Assessment by the Director of National Intelligence James Clapper which described deteriorating conditions in Iraq and Syria, based on a growing capacity of Sunni terrorist organizations and the marginalization of Sunni ethnic groups in the Iraqi Government.<sup>147</sup> In June of 2014, turbulence in the region would cascade into further

---

<sup>146</sup> Project on National Security Reform, "Preliminary Findings Report," *The Center For the Study of the Presidency*, 2008, P. 60 – 61, Web: <http://0183896.netsolhost.com/site/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/pnsr-preliminary-findings-july-2008.pdf>

<sup>147</sup> Clapper, James, "Worldwide Threat Assessment of the US Intelligence Community," *Director of national Intelligence report to the Senate Armed Services Committee*, 2014, P.5, Web: [https://www.dni.gov/files/documents/Intelligence Reports/2014 WTA SFR SSCI 29 Jan.pdf](https://www.dni.gov/files/documents/Intelligence%20Reports/2014%20WTA%20SFR%20SSCI%2029%20Jan.pdf)

instability as the Islamic State terrorist organization declared its caliphate over much of the Muslim world.<sup>148</sup> The following 2015 Worldwide Threat Assessment, delivered to the Senate Armed Services Committee, assessed the newly created Islamic State as a definitive threat to the United States homeland and its interests abroad. The Worldwide Threat Assessment described an elevated threat stemming from the Sunni extremist organization:

Although most homegrown violent extremists (HVEs) will probably continue to aspire to travel overseas, particularly to Syria and Iraq, they will probably remain the most likely Sunni violent extremist threat to the US homeland because of their immediate and direct access. Some might have been inspired by calls by the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) in late September for individual jihadists in the West to retaliate for US-led airstrikes on ISIL. Attacks by lone actors are among the most difficult to warn about because they offer few or no signatures.<sup>149</sup>

Congressional leadership all understood that counterterrorism efforts needed to shift focus to the Islamic State terrorist organization if the United States was going to protect its interests both domestically and abroad. The echoes of previous discourse emphasizing the importance of synchronization of DIMEFIL instruments in Congress would be muffled by the vast deliberative mechanisms and routine process in place in congressional government.

In the 114th legislative session, there was a considerable amount of effort surrounding the issue of counterterrorism and interagency coordination. There were 111 Congressional Committee Reports and 181 proceedings entered into the congressional

---

<sup>148</sup> BBC News, "What is 'Islamic State'?", *BBC News.com*, December 2015, Web: <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-29052144>

<sup>149</sup> Clapper, James, "Worldwide Threat Assessment of the US Intelligence Community" *Director of national Intelligence report to the Senate Armed Services Committee*, February 2015, P.5, Web: [https://www.dni.gov/files/documents/Unclassified\\_2015\\_ATA\\_SFR\\_-\\_SASC\\_FINAL.pdf](https://www.dni.gov/files/documents/Unclassified_2015_ATA_SFR_-_SASC_FINAL.pdf)

record relating to terrorism and interagency coordination.<sup>150</sup> This resulted in 118 proposed pieces of legislation related to counterterrorism, of which 16 became law. What is not represented in the statistical snapshot is the inordinate amount of oversight activity that occurred at the individual member and staff level that cannot be quantified. With the growing threat of the Islamic State on the rise, the congressional leadership understood what issues Congress faced in the 114<sup>th</sup> legislative session. Senator McCain expressed as he addressed the Center for Strategic and International Studies on his top priorities for the Senate Armed Service Committee:

We face a rising threat from violent Islamist radicals that seek to erase borders, topple governments, and foment sectarian civil war. These terrorists and militants now control more territory in the Middle East than ever, and their reach is spreading deeper into Muslim communities in Africa and South Asia. The result is that a key strategic region of the world is descending into despotism, violence, and chaos. While some may wish to minimize America's exposure to crises like this, history teaches us that we are ultimately unable to do so. In the face of these threats, our goal must be to shore up the liberal world order. We recognize, of course, that this cannot be done through military force alone. We must use all elements of our national power, including our economic, diplomatic, moral influence. But acknowledging that there is no military solution, which is a truism, should not lead us to believe that there is no military dimension to the problem—or that hard power can play no role in a favorable solution. In fact, our soft power is the shadow cast by our hard power. That is how we deter adversaries, reassure allies, defeat enemies, and add leverage to our diplomacy.<sup>151</sup>

The 114<sup>th</sup> Congress understood the threat. Additionally, the 114<sup>th</sup> Congress knew that through the synchronization of DIMEFIL capability the United States could protect its

---

<sup>150</sup> Congress.Gov, Search query for terrorism and interagency related congressional reports and legislation. <https://www.congress.gov/search?searchResultViewType=expanded&q=%7B%22search%22%3A%5B%22terrorism%22%2C%22interagency%22%2C%22interagency%22%5D%2C%22congress%22%3A%22114%22%7D>

<sup>151</sup> McCain, John, "SASC Chairman John McCain Remarks on Top Defense Priorities for 114th Congress at CSIS," *Senate Armed Service Committee*, Press Release, March 2015, Web: <https://www.armed-services.senate.gov/press-releases/sasc-chairman-john-mccain-remarks-on-top-defense-priorities-for-114th-congress-at-csis>

interests at home and abroad. In February of 2015, The President delivered the National Security Strategy to Congress which outlined the greater emphasis on DIMEFIL power projection as the foundation of its strategy to defeat the Islamic State.<sup>152</sup> The National Security Strategy even eluded to the dwindling military capability in the Middle East region following the drawdown of forces.<sup>153</sup> This signaled to Congress that emphasis towards oversight of department and agency capability would be a critical function as the military instrument would not be projected to the degree it had been in the previous decade to combat terrorism.

In the House, the declared oversight plans articulated a sturdy understanding of the requirements Congress faced in synchronizing the instruments of national power against the growing threat. The House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform relayed the emphasis for its oversight plan:

The Committee will conduct oversight of U.S. diplomatic, military, and development efforts to address the issue of global terrorism both in the short-term and long-term. The Committee's oversight will include whether the United States is maximizing the use of all elements of the national security power and how anti-terror efforts, such as the detention and trial of unlawful enemy combatants, are coordinated with other important U.S. national security interests and the rule of law. The Committee's review will include the international standing of the United States, humanitarian assistance, development programs, and public diplomacy efforts.”<sup>154</sup>

In the other standing committees representing DIMEFIL equities, the emphasis for oversight relayed the importance of ensuring that the authorizations and appropriations

---

<sup>152</sup> Obama, Barack, “National Security Strategy,” *National Archives*, February 2015, P. 26, Web: <http://nssarchive.us/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/2015.pdf>

<sup>153</sup> Ibid. P. 7.

<sup>154</sup> Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, “Oversight Plan,” *U.S. House of Representatives*, 114th Congress, Web: <https://democrats-oversight.house.gov/oversight-plan>

were streamlined to maximize individual instrument capability. For instance, the House Justice Committee, in its oversight plan for the 114<sup>th</sup> Congress noted:

The Committee will also conduct oversight of all agencies and programs within its jurisdiction to uncover waste, fraud, or abuse and to identify programs that are inefficient, duplicative, or outdated, or that are more appropriately administered by State or local governments.<sup>155</sup>

Linking oversight to tangible action in the budgeting process was articulated in the Committee on Homeland Security as well. “the Committee will work to identify potential opportunities to eliminate duplicative or unnecessary programs, find efficiencies that will contribute to the Department’s ability to meet its vital missions.”<sup>156</sup> Congress’ sights were set on ensuring that effective oversight was honed in on ensuring that the right capabilities existed in the departments and agencies. Congress, according to their oversight plans, would hone in on executive department and agency programs to determine if adjustments would need to occur. Congress would examine which programs were to be authorized and examine funding levels for each program within the executive department and agencies to ensure that the right mix of DIMEFIL capability existed to project national power against the growing terrorist threat.

Intent did not match action for the 114<sup>th</sup> Congress. Although a considerable amount of bills were introduced and only a small fraction became law, much of the 114<sup>th</sup> legislative effort was focused on House and Senate Armed Services Committee passing the National Defense Authorization Act. Restrictions on discretionary spending

---

<sup>155</sup> Committee on The Judiciary, “Oversight Plan For The 114th Congress,” *U.S. House of Representatives*, February 12, 2015, P. 1, Web: <https://judiciary.house.gov/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/114th-Congress-Oversight-Plan.pdf>

<sup>156</sup> The Committee on Homeland Security, “Oversight Plan of 114<sup>th</sup> Congress,” *U.S. House of Representatives*, P. 2-3, Web: <http://docs.house.gov/meetings/HM/HM00/20150121/102837/HMTG-114-HM00-20150121-SD002.pdf>

established by the Budget Control Act of 2011 meant that the House and Senate would cut the defense budget, which ultimately led to a presidential veto.<sup>157</sup> Both the House and Senate had to rework the budget and with the assistance of the Bipartisan Budget Control Act of 2015, the House and Senate were able to increase the funding levels of the National Defense Authorization Act and have it signed into law in November 2015. The effect was that the DoD paid for base budget items with money that was allocated for Overseas Contingency Operations which reduced spending for specific counterterrorism efforts to include war-related appropriations and the counterterrorism partnership fund.<sup>158</sup>

## Conclusion

The congressional effort in the 114<sup>th</sup> Congress to synchronize the instruments of national power did not produce any substantial results beyond the passing of the National Defense Authorization Act. For the other major stake holding committees representing DIMEFIL capability, they did not receive new authorizations in 2015. The Department of State's last authorization, at the time, was signed into law was in 2003.<sup>159</sup> The Justice Department's last authorization was in 2009.<sup>160</sup> The 114<sup>th</sup> Congress failed to pass the Intelligence Authorization Act, it cleared the House but did not pass the Senate.<sup>161</sup> Of the

---

<sup>157</sup> Towell, Pat, "Fact Sheet: Selected Highlights of the FY2016 Defense Budget Debate and the National Defense Authorization Act," *Congressional Research Service*, Dec 2015, Web: <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/R44019.pdf>

<sup>158</sup> Government Accountability Office, "Overseas Contingency Operations, Report to Congressional Requesters," *Government Accountability Office*, Jan 2017, P. 24, Web: <http://www.gao.gov/assets/690/682158.pdf>

<sup>159</sup> Vinik, Danny, "Meet your Unauthorized Federal Government," *The Agenda*. Politico, February 3, 2016, Web: <https://www.politico.com/agenda/story/2016/02/government-agencies-programs-unauthorized-000036-000037>

<sup>160</sup> Vinik, Danny, "Meet your Unauthorized Federal Government," *The Agenda*. Politico, February 3, 2016, Web: <https://www.politico.com/agenda/story/2016/02/government-agencies-programs-unauthorized-000036-000037>

<sup>161</sup> Congress.gov, "All Actions. H.R.6393 - Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017." Web: <https://www.congress.gov/bill/114th-congress/house-bill/6393/all-actions>

federal government's discretionary spending for 2015, 29.5% was spent on unauthorized programs.<sup>162</sup> The effect of the unauthorized spending is that a comprehensive review of the spending plan to meet counterterrorism objectives was not completed as advertised by Congress in their priorities for oversight. Authorizations for spending for the executive departments and agencies were disjointed and reflect priorities as far back twelve years from the 114th legislative session. To add a further degree of friction to the synchronization of the instruments of national power the 114<sup>th</sup> Congress introduced a continuing resolution Omnibus Appropriations Bill for 2016.<sup>163</sup> This furthered the degradation of oversight capability of Congress to deliberate the spending plan for national security equities. A Congressional Research Service report in 2016 noted:

In addition to the customary concern of sacrificing the opportunity for debate and amendment for greater legislative efficiency that arises whenever complex legislation is considered under time constraints, the use of omnibus appropriations acts has generated controversy for other reasons. These include whether adequate consideration was given to regular appropriations acts prior to their incorporation into omnibus appropriations legislation, the use of across the board rescissions, and the inclusion of significant legislative (rather than funding) provisions.<sup>164</sup>

The 114th legislative session had the authorities to review the authorizations and appropriations for executive branch departments and agencies. The budgeting process gives Congress the mechanisms to reevaluate DIMEFIL capability and build comprehensive national power commensurate to the threat to achieve national objectives.

---

<sup>162</sup>Vinik, Danny, "Meet your Unauthorized Federal Government," The Agenda. Politico, February 3, 2016, Web: <https://www.politico.com/agenda/story/2016/02/government-agencies-programs-unauthorized-000036-000037>

<sup>163</sup> Congress.gov, "All Actions. H.R.2029 - Consolidated Appropriations Act," 2016. Web: <https://www.congress.gov/bill/114th-congress/house-bill/2029/actions>

<sup>164</sup> Saturno, James; Tollestrup, Jessica, "Omnibus Appropriations Acts: Overview of Recent Practices," *Congressional Research Service*, Jan 2016, P. I, Web: <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RL32473.pdf>



When Congress forgoes authorizations, and passes omnibus or continuing resolution appropriation bills it represents the minimum ability to be reactive to issues facing national security.

The impact that this has on DIMEFIL capability is it creates strategic gaps. If congress does not evaluate strategy and determine department and agency capability commensurate to the requirements then it runs the risk of funding and appropriating departments and agencies independent of strategy objectives. The responsibility of funding is then deferred to the executive branch and an over reliance on Overseas Contingency Operations funding to fill normative spending requirements rises.

If strategy is incumbent on integration, then DIMEFIL development through appropriation and budgeting and oversight should be integral to determining overall ability to achieve strategic ends. An example of strategic gaps caused by lack of cross coordination can also be seen in the 2011 to 2015 budgets, in the time period that saw the rise of the Islamic State. In 2011, there was an inevitable void that was created by the drawdown of military forces in Iraq. Many of the efforts that were led by the Department of Defense fell on the State Department after the transition. Around the same time frame, the 2011 National Strategy for Counterterrorism was published and it articulated the need for integrated DIMEFIL capability along with congressional evaluation of power projection capability.<sup>165</sup> The strategy stated that, “this strategy integrates the capabilities and authorities of each department and agency, ensuring that the right tools are applied at

---

<sup>165</sup> Saturno, James; Tollestrup, Jessica, “Omnibus Appropriations Acts: Overview of Recent Practices,” *Congressional Research Service*, Jan 2016, P. 2, Web: <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RL32473.pdf>

the right time to the right situation.”<sup>166</sup> The military withdrawal from Iraq set the conditions for a terrorism threat that would place emphasis on integration of DIMEFIL capability absent the lead of the DoD.

The void that the military left put the requirement on the State Department to see the national strategy through to its desired ends in Iraq. A 2011 Congressional Research Service report on State Department funding notes that there were doubts on the, “State Department’s capacity to take over more than 300 activities—ranging from environmental cleanup to medical support—that the U.S. military had been performing.”<sup>167</sup> The roll of oversight at this critical juncture should have been focused on the ability of the state department to achieve policy objectives. The House Foreign Affairs committee conducted three hearings on the transition of authority to the State Department.<sup>168</sup> Many policy experts were called, but only one member of the DoD attended during the hearing.<sup>169</sup> The theme in the testimony was that there was an “unprecedented level of coordination between the DoD and State Department in preparation for the transition, and the proposed budget reflects the ability of the State

---

<sup>166</sup> U.S. Government. National Strategy for Combating Terrorism. 2011. P. 7. Web: [https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/sites/default/files/counterterrorism\\_strategy.pdf](https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/sites/default/files/counterterrorism_strategy.pdf)

<sup>167</sup> Epstein, Lawson & Resler. Fact Sheet: The FY2012 State and Foreign Operations Budget Request. *Congressional Research Service*. 2011. P. 1. Web: [https://congressional-proquest-com.proxy1.library.jhu.edu/congressional/result/pqpresultpage.gispdfhitspanel.pdflink/\\$2fapp-bin\\$2fgis-congresearch\\$2ff\\$2f1\\$2fe\\$2fd\\$2fcrs-2011-fdt-0299\\_from\\_1\\_to\\_9.pdf/entitlementkeys=1234%7Capp-gis%7Ccongresearch%7Ccrs-2011-fdt-0299v](https://congressional-proquest-com.proxy1.library.jhu.edu/congressional/result/pqpresultpage.gispdfhitspanel.pdflink/$2fapp-bin$2fgis-congresearch$2ff$2f1$2fe$2fd$2fcrs-2011-fdt-0299_from_1_to_9.pdf/entitlementkeys=1234%7Capp-gis%7Ccongresearch%7Ccrs-2011-fdt-0299v)

<sup>168</sup> ProQuest Hearing Search results. <https://congressional-proquest-com.proxy1.library.jhu.edu/congressional/result/congressional/pqpdocumentview?accountid=11752&groupid=102776&pgId=0cb869a8-23e2-497b-921e-6ac9c265e44f&rsId=169C766C93En>; <https://congressional-proquest-com.proxy1.library.jhu.edu/congressional/result/congressional/pqpdocumentview?accountid=11752&groupid=102776&pgId=f6ad39a7-06dd-4e67-ac41-e40842440ed4&rsId=169C766C93E>;

<sup>169</sup> Ibid.

Department to successfully transition and ensure stability in Iraq.<sup>170</sup> In the hearings, there is only reference to diplomatic, military and law enforcement capabilities with no real evaluation of other instruments in the execution of strategic objectives. The minimal oversight of federal governments activities can be attributed to the jurisdictional scope of the House Foreign Affairs committee. The committee is charged with overseeing the State and DoD foreign activities, not the holistic application of strategies as it applies to overall US objectives.

The budgeting action in this time period also reduced the State Department funding and subjected the budgeting cycle to several continuing resolutions that further limited congressional oversight and control. The State Department Foreign Operations budget was reduced from \$35.3 billion in the 2010 budget to \$33.8 billion in 2011 budget.<sup>171</sup> Additionally, spending remained relatively flat until the 2015 time frame when the foreign operations budget was raised to \$36.93 billion.<sup>172</sup> State Department spending in Iraq fell proportionally from \$9 billion in 2010 to \$ 5 billion in 2011 amid the drawdown of military forces in Iraq.<sup>173</sup> The strategic gap in this instance was a reduction in State Department power projection capability in concert with a Department of Defense drawdown. This was in large part due to the Budget Control Act which set limits on overall spending. The appropriations and budget cycle reduced power projection

---

<sup>170</sup> Haslach, Patricia. Transition and Strategic Framework in Iraq. *Hearing before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Sub Committee for Middle East and South Asia*. 1 June 2011. Web: <https://congressional-proquest-com.proxy1.library.jhu.edu/congressional/result/congressional/pqpdocumentview?accountid=11752&groupid=102776&pgId=4725bc1b-6cfc-49d0-9b28-d05be749ee5c&rsId=169C78F9E6B>

<sup>171</sup> Morgenstern, Emily. Department of State and Foreign Operations Appropriations: History of Legislation and Funding in Brief. Congressional Research Service. 2019. P. 8. Web: <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R44637.pdf>

<sup>172</sup> Ibid.

<sup>173</sup> Belasco, Amy. The Cost of Iraq, Afghanistan, and Other Global War on Terror Operations Since 9/11. Congressional Research Service. P. 17. Web: <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/RL33110.pdf>

capability at a critical period that caused cuts to critical programs within the state department that directly affected the ability of the State Department to achieve its objectives.<sup>174</sup>

Although there are a multitude of factors that set the conditions for the Islamic State to gain influence in Iraq during this timeframe, the US presence was not capable of addressing the conditions that led to the expansion of the terrorist threat. Little was done through congressional oversight to evaluate the coordinated capability of DIMEFIL instruments to achieve national objectives. Ultimately congressional action reduced the State Departments Foreign Operations spending in Iraq at a critical juncture. Oversight in this instance did focus on the programmatic specifics of DIMEFIL capability which ultimately produced a gap that necessitated the redeployment of military powers to achieve strategic ends.

The DIMEFIL power projection capability should be evaluated on a regular schedule commensurate the detail provided in the guiding strategic documents. Oversight on department and agency programs is not focused towards strategic ends. Spending bills are lumped together and passed without the degree of fidelity commensurate to twelve separate regular appropriation bills. Congress has the capability and understands the need to synchronize the instruments of national power. Congress has studied the problem associated with synchronization and understands the requirements. Jurisdictional

---

<sup>174</sup> Gerth, Jeff. As ISIS Brewed in Iraq, Clinton's State Department Cut Eyes and Ears on the Ground. *ProPublica, The Breakdown*. 2016. Web: <https://www.propublica.org/article/as-isis-brewed-in-iraq-state-department-cut-its-eyes-and-ears-on-the-ground>

challenges in the committee structure and the ineffective budgeting process detract from Congress' ability to synchronize the instruments of national power.

## **Conclusion**

This thesis portfolio presents an approach to understanding the challenges involved with coordinating the DIMEFIL instruments in both the executive and congressional branch of government. The expansion of the instruments of national over time has allowed the United States to project distinct capability across the DIMEFIL spectrum to secure the nation's interest. This expansion has challenged the organization and structure of both the executive and congressional branches of government as it seeks to build capability and capacity and seeks to project coordinated power to achieve national security objectives. There is a wealth of existing scholarship that details normative challenges in both the executive and congressional branch in the formulation of coordinated strategy, but what this thesis portfolio adds to the topic is an examination of the challenges to coordinating strategy from the perspective of DIMEFIL elements of power projection and how they manifest in government. This portfolio theorizes that the growth in the instruments of national power has led to a degree of decentralized control among the newer additions to the list of instruments that affect the ability to coordinate strategy in the executive and congressional branches of government.

The key point discovered in the first chapter is that the instruments of national power, which represent the capabilities the US uses to project power abroad, have grown over time to include a broader range of distinct powers. In order to illustrate this point, the first chapter examines the growth of the instruments of national power from pre-WWII to contemporary times. The concept of instruments of national power have expanded to what is known today as DIMEFIL instruments of national power. These instruments manifest in the departments and agencies in either a centralized or

decentralized manner. The military and diplomatic powers are centralized institutions, in that they are represented by one federal department each. The newer additions to the DIMEFIL spectrum, specifically intelligence and law enforcement are decentralized, because they are controlled by many different departments and agencies. This framework for analysis identifies challenges that affect coordinated strategy.

The second chapter details challenges to effective coordination in the National Security Council. The key finding articulated in this chapter details how existing friction points to developing national security strategy manifest. The bureaucratic nature of the NSC, the over reliance on the DoD, parochialism among the federal agencies, and the tendency to weigh crisis management over deliberate planning all challenge the coordination of the instruments of national power against national security objectives. The decentralized nature of law enforcement and intelligence instruments further challenges existing friction points because effective strategy then requires a larger degree of coordination among departments and agencies that share power projection capability.

The third chapter makes a similar claim but is focused on the congressional branch which by design is a larger deliberative body than the National Security Council and is subject to its own distinct challenges when creating capability and capacity for power projection. The key finding that this chapter presents is that the contentious relationship Congress has with the executive, jurisdiction of committees and effective congressional budgeting and oversight all present challenges to affecting coordinated strategy. The expansion of the instruments of national power to include distinct DIMEFIL core capabilities further challenges the existing friction points, primarily because instrumental core capability exists across several departments and agencies and

in turn are spread across an even further range of congressional committees. This presents challenges when developing core capability and executing essential oversight to determine obsolete and redundant programs.

The fourth chapter presents a case study that showcases the reforms that were suggested by the 9/11 Commission Report as it identified the challenges to effective synchronization along the range of instruments of national power. The case study analyzes the reform in the intelligence and law enforcement instruments as the DNI and DHS were created to provide a more coordinated effort in strategy and power projection. Although many reforms were proposed, minimal changes were made. The second part of the case study examines the rise of ISIL which signaled much of the same asymmetric threat that necessitated a well-coordinated effort similar to the conditions examined in the 9/11 Commission Report. Many of the committees stressed effective oversight and an examination of power projection capability, but minimal congressional action occurred in that session of Congress which was evidenced by nonexistent authorization bills, and an omnibus spending bill that validated pre-ISIL spending during the rise of a significant threat to national security. This case study shows how the authorization and appropriations process, committee jurisdiction and oversight present challenges to the coordination of power projection capability.

Coordinated strategy is essential to power projection. Synchronization among the executive agencies enables the United States to project the totality of DIMEFIL capability against the multitude of national security objectives in a manner that optimizes limited resources. A United States Government Accountability Office statement on interagency collaboration states: “National security threats have evolved and require



involvement beyond the traditional agencies of DOD, the Department of State, and USAID. The Departments of Homeland Security, Energy, Justice, the Treasury, Agriculture, Commerce, and Health and Human Services are now a bigger part of the equation. What has not yet evolved are the mechanisms that agencies use to coordinate national security activities such as developing overarching strategies to guide planning and execution of missions, or sharing and integrating national security information across agencies.”<sup>175</sup> The efficiencies of synchronization are predicated on the economical distribution of DIMEFIL instrument projection. Effective synchronization starts at the top. Agencies working in concert through policy synchronization, driven by the NSC, as well as the elimination of redundancies or inefficiencies within the DIMEFIL instruments will provide cohesive strategy advantages. Krugler compliments this theory as he notes: “To maximize their influence and effectiveness, [instruments of national power] are best viewed as members of a team, each of which has a specialized role to play in a coherent approach that blends their unique roles.”<sup>176</sup> As the financial, intelligence and law enforcement instruments of national power increase in projection capability, the National Security Council will have to make a greater effort in coordinating DIMEFIL instruments in order to maximize the effectiveness of national power against national security objectives.<sup>177</sup>

### Utility of Portfolio

---

<sup>175</sup> Pendleton, John. National Security: Key Challenges and Solutions to Strengthen Interagency Collaboration. GAO Reports. 2010. P. 3. Web: <https://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-10-822T>

<sup>176</sup> Kugler, Richard. *Policy Analysis in National Security Affairs*. National Defense University Press; 2006. P. 94. Web: <https://ndupress.ndu.edu/Media/News/Article/1216779/policy-analysis-in-national-security-affairs-new-methods-for-a-new-era/>

<sup>177</sup> Chollet, Derek. *What’s Wrong with Obama’s National Security Council?* Defense One; National Journal Group. 2016. Web: <http://www.defenseone.com/ideas/2016/04/whats-wrong-obamas-national-security-council/127802/?oref=d-river>

Much of the existing scholarship on the subject of national security relates to the political environment that shapes the formulation of national strategy or it examines the nature of power projection as it relates to the complexities of the operational environment. This portfolio contributes to the topic of national strategy, force development, and power projection by providing a detailed examination of the nature of national strategy as it exists and relates to core capability at the executive and congressional level. The friction points identified in both the second and third chapter offer a hypothesis on the challenges to strategy as they relate to synchronizing the core capabilities of power projection. Examining how the government is structured among the executive and congressional branch overlaid with the core power projection capabilities, identifies distinct challenges to effective coordination. This portfolio provides utility in any further examination of current organizational structure in both the executive and congressional branches of government because it identifies weak points that limit effective synchronization. This portfolio contributes to the discussion in the Joint Professional Military Education's body of scholarship particularly in the study of the instruments of national power. This examination provides insight into how government structure affects the ability to project the instruments of national power. Additionally, this examination of DIMEFIL instruments against organizational structure aids in organizational analysis of existing governmental structure to improve the development of national security policy.<sup>178</sup> An awareness of the challenges is the first step in planning a mitigation strategy.

---

<sup>178</sup> Joint Chiefs of Staff. "Command Red Team." Joint Doctrine Note 1-16. 16 May 2016. P. 1-1. Web: [https://fas.org/irp/doddir/dod/jdn1\\_16.pdf](https://fas.org/irp/doddir/dod/jdn1_16.pdf)

The outlook for the government's ability to coordinate the instruments of national power towards national security objectives will continue to be subject to existential challenges in the executive and congressional branches of government. The 2019 World Wide threat assessment sends a clear warning that signals touch points across the range of instruments of national power:

The post-World War II international system is coming under increasing strain amid continuing cyber and WMD proliferation threats, competition in space, and regional conflicts. Among the disturbing trends are hostile states and actors' intensifying online efforts to influence and interfere with elections here and abroad and their use of chemical weapons. Terrorism too will continue to be a top threat to US and partner interests worldwide, particularly in Sub-Saharan Africa, the Middle East, South Asia, and Southeast Asia. The development and application of new technologies will introduce both risks and opportunities, and the US economy will be challenged by slower global economic growth and growing threats to US economic competitiveness.<sup>179</sup>

As the US national security enterprise is exposed to increasing strain from external actors, there will be further strain on the ability to affect a well-coordinated strategy both in Congress and the executive branch. Activity against one national objective will have second and third order effects on another.

The instruments of national power have been on a growth trajectory, and as the complexities of the operating environment increase, the United States will seek ways to project power commensurate to the threat and operating environment. This dynamic multi-domain environment will stress the ability of the National Security Council to consolidate and coordinate the individual instruments of national power distributed among varying authority across several departments and agencies. It will also stress the

---

<sup>179</sup> Cotes, Daniel. "World Wide Threat Assessment of the United States Intelligence Community." Office of the Director Of National Intelligence, Report for the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. 29 January 2019. Web: <https://www.dni.gov/files/ODNI/documents/2019-ATA-SFR---SSCI.pdf>

ability of Congress to effectively ensure the departments and agencies are authorized and appropriated in a manner that enables coordinated strategy commensurate to the current threat.

The challenges associated with the growth of the instruments of national power will necessitate a focus on DIMEFIL capabilities and coordination in both the executive and congressional branches. In the executive branch the interagency policy committee of the NSC will have to assess the programmatic specifics of DIMEFIL capability as they develop policy and drive subordinate department and agency strategy. The addition of finance, intelligence and law enforcement powers adds a level of complexity because they have supporting and enabling touch points with all the instruments of power in the execution of strategy. Congress will have to address the cross jurisdictional limitations of budgeting and oversight. As the capabilities that are developed in departments and agencies are integrated with supporting and enabling capabilities outside the jurisdictional control of respective congressional committees, holistic oversight will be essential to ensuring that budgeting and oversight is focused on effective execution of strategy and delegated authorities.

Figure 1

National Security Council and DIME Instruments					
Instrument of Power	Centralized/Decentralized	Department or Agency	NSC Membership Status	Representative	Relevant Strategies
Diplomatic	Centralized*	Department of State	Statute Member	Secretary of State	Joint Strategic Plan
		USAID/ State Department	Non Statute Member	Secretary of State	Joint Strategic Plan
Information	Decentralized	All Departments and Agencies			
Military	Centralized	Department of Defense	Statute Member	Secretary of Defense	National Defense Strategy
			Statute Advisor	Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff	National Military Strategy
Economic	Decentralized	National Economic Council	Non Statute Member**	Director of the National Economic Council	Economic Report of the President
		Department of State	Statute Member	Secretary of State	Joint Strategic Plan
		Department of Treasury	Non Statute Regular Attendee	Secretary of the Treasury	Treasury Strategic Plan
		Department of Agriculture	Non Statute Member**	Secretary of Agriculture	USDA Strategic Plan
		Department of Commerce	Non Statute Member**	Secretary of Commerce	Department of Commerce Strategic Plan
		Department of Energy	Statute Member	Secretary of Energy	Department of Energy Strategic Plan
Finance	Decentralized	Department of Treasury	Non Statute Regular Attendee	Secretary of the Treasury	Treasury Strategic Plan
		Department of Homeland Security	Non Statute Regular Attendee	Secretary of Homeland Security	Department of Homeland Security Strategic Plan
		Intelligence Community	Statute Advisor	Director of National Intelligence	National Intelligence Strategy
Intelligence	Decentralized***	Office of the Director of National Intelligence	Statute Advisor	Director of National Intelligence	National Intelligence Strategy***
		Air Force Intelligence			
		Army Intelligence			
		Central Intelligence Agency	Non Statute Member**	Director of Central Intelligence	
		Coast Guard Intelligence			
		Defense Intelligence Agency			
		Department of Energy			
		Department of Homeland Security			
		Department of State			
		Department of Treasury			
		Drug Enforcement Administration			
		Federal Bureau of Investigations			
		Marine Corps Intelligence			
		National Geospatial Intelligence Agency			
		National Reconnaissance Office			
		National Security Agency			
		Navy Intelligence			
Law Enforcement	Decentralized	Department of Defense	Statute Member	Secretary of Defense	Department of Justice Strategic Plan
		Department of Homeland Security	Non Statute Regular Attendee	Secretary of Homeland Security	Department of Homeland Security Strategic Plan
		Department of Justice	Non Statute Regular Attendee	Attorney General	Department of Justice Strategic Plan
		Department of Treasury	Non Statute Regular Attendee	Secretary of the Treasury	Treasury Strategic Plan

\*USAID is an independent agency that reports to the State Department.

\*\* Non-Statute Members of NSC attend when issues are pertinent to their department or agency.

\*\*\* The Director of National Intelligence controls overarching policy and sets national priorities, but the individual departments and agencies IC are responsible for the direction of intelligence operations.

## Bibliography

1. Adams, Gordon & Murry, Shoon. *Mission Creep: The militarization of US foreign Policy*; Georgetown University Press; 2014.
2. Arwood, Sam; Robert Mills; and Richard Raines. "Operational Art and Strategy in Cyberspace." Proceedings of the International Conference on Information Warfare & Security, January 2010, 16–22.  
<http://search.ebscohost.com.proxy1.library.jhu.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ts&AN=49549137&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
3. Auerswald, David P., Campbell Colton C. *Congress and the Politics of National Security*. Cambridge University Press. 2012.
4. BBC News. "What is 'Islamic State'?" BBC News.com. December 2015. Web: <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-29052144>
5. Bartholomees, Boone. Theory of War and Strategy. US Army War College, Guide to National Security Issues. Strategic Studies Institute. 2010. Web: [http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/ssi/guide\\_natsec\\_v1\\_2010.pdf](http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/ssi/guide_natsec_v1_2010.pdf)
6. Belasco, Amy. The Cost of Iraq, Afghanistan, and Other Global War on Terror Operations Since 9/11. *Congressional Research Service*. P. 17. Web: <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/RL33110.pdf>
7. Best, Richard. "Director of National Intelligence Statutory Authorities: Status and Proposals." Congressional Research Service. December 2011. Summary. Web: <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/intel/RL34231.pdf>
8. Best, Richard A. "The National Security Council: An Organizational Assessment." Washington, D.C., Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, 2009, Web: <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/RL30840.pdf>
9. Best, Richard A. "The National Security Council: An Organizational Assessment." Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress. 2011. Web: <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/RL30840.pdf>
10. Blackwill, Robert & Harris, Jennifer. "War By other means." Harvard university Press. 2016.

11. Born, Hans; Leigh, Ian & Willis, Aidan. "Intelligence Cooperation and Accountability." Routledge. January 2011. Web:  
<https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/jhu/reader.action?docID=668167&ppg=16>
12. Brzezinski, Zbigniew. *Power and Principle*. McGraw-Hill Ryerson. 1983
13. Carr, Edward H. *The Twenty Years' Crisis 1919-1939, An Introduction to The Study of International Relations*. London, England. MacMillan & Co. Ltd. 1946.
14. Carter, Ashton B, and John Patrick White. *Keeping the Edge: Managing Defense for the Future*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2001 Chapter 10, Deutch, Kanter, Scowcroft. "Strengthening the National Security Interagency Process." Web:  
<http://web.a.ebscohost.com.proxy1.library.jhu.edu/ehost/ebookviewer/ebook?sid=cf393249-1a1d-48b6-969a-072f1f3497dd%40sdc-v-sessmgr02&vid=0&format=EB>
15. Catipon, Ronnie S. "Law Enforcement as an Instrument of National Power." The Foreign Service Journal. American Foreign Service Association. March 2017. Web: <http://www.afsa.org/law-enforcement-instrument-national-power>
16. Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, *National Military Strategic Plan for the War on Terrorism*, 2006. Web: <https://www.hsdl.org/?view&did=459916>
17. Chollet, Derek. *What's Wrong with Obama's National Security Council?* Defense One; National Journal Group. 2016. Web:  
<http://www.defenseone.com/ideas/2016/04/whats-wrong-obamas-national-security-council/127802/?oref=d-river>
18. Clapper, James. *Worldwide Threat Assessment of the Intelligence Community for the Senate Armed Services Committee*. Director of National Intelligence. 2011. Web: [https://www.dni.gov/files/documents/Newsroom/Testimonies/20110310\\_testimony\\_clapper.pdf](https://www.dni.gov/files/documents/Newsroom/Testimonies/20110310_testimony_clapper.pdf)
19. Clapper, James. "Worldwide Threat Assessment of the US Intelligence Community." Director of national Intelligence report to the Senate Armed Services Committee. 2014. Web: [https://www.dni.gov/files/documents/Intelligence Reports/2014 WWTASFR\\_SSCI\\_29\\_Jan.pdf](https://www.dni.gov/files/documents/Intelligence Reports/2014 WWTASFR_SSCI_29_Jan.pdf)
20. Clapper, James. "Worldwide Threat Assessment of the US Intelligence Community". Director of National Intelligence report to the Senate Armed Services Committee. February 2015. Web:

[https://www.dni.gov/files/documents/Unclassified\\_2015\\_ATA\\_SFR\\_-\\_SASC\\_FINAL.pdf](https://www.dni.gov/files/documents/Unclassified_2015_ATA_SFR_-_SASC_FINAL.pdf)

21. Clapper, James. *Worldwide Threat Assessment of the Intelligence Community*. Director of National Intelligence. 2016. Web: [https://www.dni.gov/files/documents/SASC\\_Unclassified\\_2016\\_ATA\\_SFR\\_FINAL.pdf](https://www.dni.gov/files/documents/SASC_Unclassified_2016_ATA_SFR_FINAL.pdf)
22. Clinton, Joshua D., et al. "Influencing the Bureaucracy: The Irony of Congressional Oversight." *American Journal of Political Science*, vol. 58, no. 2, 2014, JSTOR, [www.jstor.org/stable/24363492](http://www.jstor.org/stable/24363492).
23. Committee on Homeland Security. "Oversight Plan of 114<sup>th</sup> Congress." P. 2-3. Web: <http://docs.house.gov/meetings/HM/HM00/20150121/102837/HMTG-114-HM00-20150121-SD002.pdf>
24. Committee on The Judiciary. "Oversight Plan for the 114th Congress." February 12, 2015. P. 1. Web: <https://judiciary.house.gov/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/114th-Congress-Oversight-Plan.pdf>
25. Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. Oversight Plan. U.S. House of Representatives. 114th Congress. Web: <https://democrats-oversight.house.gov/oversight-plan>
26. Congress.gov. "All Actions." H.R.6393 - Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017. Web: <https://www.congress.gov/bill/114th-congress/house-bill/6393/all-actions>
27. Congress.gov. "All Actions." H.R.2029 - Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016. Web: <https://www.congress.gov/bill/114th-congress/house-bill/2029/actions>
28. Congress.Gov. Search query for terrorism and interagency related congressional reports and legislation. <https://www.congress.gov/search?searchResultViewType=expanded&q=%7B%22search%22%3A%5B%22terrorism%22%2C%22interagency%22%2C%22interagency%22%5D%2C%22congress%22%3A%22114%22%7D>
29. Cotes, Daniel. "World Wide Threat Assessment of the United States Intelligence Community." Office of the Director of National Intelligence, Report for the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. 29 January 2019. Web: <https://www.dni.gov/files/ODNI/documents/2019-ATA-SFR---SSCI.pdf>
30. Clausewitz, Carl Von. *On War*. Everyman's Library, Alfred Knopf. 1993



31. Cull, Nicholas. *The Decline and Fall of the United States Information Agency*. Plagrave McMillan. 2012. Web:  
<https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/jhu/detail.action?docID=1138374>
32. Dale, Catherine. "National Security Strategy: Mandates, Execution to Date, and Issues for Congress." Congressional Research Service. August 2013. Web:  
<https://fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/R43174.pdf>
33. Dale, Sarafino and Towell. "A Unified National Security Budget? Issues for Congress." Congressional Research Service. March 2013. Web:  
<https://fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/R42997.pdf>
34. Dolan, Halchin, Garvey, Oleszek, Ginsberg. "Congressional Oversight Manual." Congressional Research Service. 2014. Web:  
<https://fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RL30240.pdf>
35. Epstein, Lawson & Resler. Fact Sheet: The FY2012 State and Foreign Operations Budget Request. *Congressional Research Service*. 2011. P. 1. Web:  
[https://congressional-proquest-com.proxy1.library.jhu.edu/congressional/result/pqpresultpage.gispdfhitspanel.pdf?link/\\$2fapp-bin\\$2fgis-congresearch\\$2ff\\$2fl\\$2fe\\$2fd\\$2fcrs-2011-fdt-0299+from+1+to+9.pdf/entitlementkeys=1234%7Capp-gis%7Ccongresearch%7Ccrs-2011-fdt-0299v](https://congressional-proquest-com.proxy1.library.jhu.edu/congressional/result/pqpresultpage.gispdfhitspanel.pdf?link/$2fapp-bin$2fgis-congresearch$2ff$2fl$2fe$2fd$2fcrs-2011-fdt-0299+from+1+to+9.pdf/entitlementkeys=1234%7Capp-gis%7Ccongresearch%7Ccrs-2011-fdt-0299v)
36. Federal Bureau of Investigation. International Operations. About, Leadership and Structure. United States Department of Justice. 2019. Web:  
<https://www.fbi.gov/about/leadership-and-structure/international-operations>
37. Ford, Gerald R. "Congress, The Presidency and National Security Policy." *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, vol. 16, no. 2, 1986, JSTOR,  
[www.jstor.org/stable/40574643](http://www.jstor.org/stable/40574643)
38. George, Roger Z, and Harvey Rishikof. *The National Security Enterprise: Navigating the Labyrinth*. Arburg, Gerald. Chapter 11: Washington: Georgetown University Press, 2010.
39. Gerth, Jeff. As ISIS Brewed in Iraq, Clinton's State Department Cut Eyes and Ears on the Ground. *ProPublica, The Breakdown*. 2016. Web:  
<https://www.propublica.org/article/as-isis-brewed-in-iraq-state-department-cut-its-eyes-and-ears-on-the-ground>

40. Government Accountability Office. "Overseas Contingency Operations. Report to Congressional Requesters." Jan 2017. Web: <http://www.gao.gov/assets/690/682158.pdf>
41. Greenwood, Max, "UK resumes intelligence-sharing with US: reports." The Hill. May 2017. Web: <https://thehill.com/policy/national-security/335232-uk-resumes-sharing-intelligence-information-with-us-report> (
42. Halchin, Kaiser. "Congressional Oversight." Congressional Research Service. Oct 2012. P. 1 Web: <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/97-936.pdf>
43. Hamilton, Alexander, et al. "Federalist Papers," The Floating Press, 2011. ProQuest Ebook Central, Web: <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/jhu/detail.action?docID=870608>
44. Haslach, Patricia. Transition and Strategic Framework in Iraq. *Hearing before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Sub Committee for Middle East and South Asia*. 1 June 2011. Web: <https://congressional-proquest-com.proxy1.library.jhu.edu/congressional/result/congressional/pqpdocumentview?accountid=11752&groupid=102776&pgId=4725bc1b-6cfc-49d0-9b28-d05be749ee5c&rsId=169C78F9E6B>
45. Heitshusen, Valerie. "Committee Types and Roles." Congressional Research Service. May 2017. Web: <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/98-241.pdf>
46. Heniff, Lynch, Tollestop. "Introduction to the Federal Budget Process," Congressional Research Service, December 2012, Web: <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/98-721.pdf>
47. Hoffman, Francis; Neuhard, Ryan. *Avoiding Strategic Inertia: Enabling the National Security Council*. Foreign Policy Research Institute. 2016. Web: <https://www-sciencedirect-com.proxy1.library.jhu.edu/science/article/pii/S0030438716000041>
48. Holmes, Kim. *Memo to a New President: How Best to Organize the National Security Council*. Heritage Foundation, April 2016. Web: <https://www.heritage.org/defense/report/memo-new-president-how-best-organize-the-national-security-council>
49. Johnson, David. "Fighting the "Islamic State" The Case for US Ground Forces." Parameters, US army War College. 2015. Web:

[https://ssi.armywarcollege.edu/pubs/parameters/Issues/Spring\\_2015/4\\_Special-Commentary\\_Johnson.pdf](https://ssi.armywarcollege.edu/pubs/parameters/Issues/Spring_2015/4_Special-Commentary_Johnson.pdf)

50. Joint Chiefs of Staff. "Command Red Team." Joint Doctrine Note 1-16. 16 May 2016. Pp. 1-1. Web: [https://fas.org/irp/doddir/dod/jdn1\\_16.pdf](https://fas.org/irp/doddir/dod/jdn1_16.pdf)
51. Joint Doctrine Note 1-18: Strategy, Joint Chiefs of Staff. 25 April 2018, P. II-5. Web: [https://fas.org/irp/doddir/dod/jdn1\\_18.pdf](https://fas.org/irp/doddir/dod/jdn1_18.pdf)
52. Joint Publication 3-0 Joint Operations. Department of Defense. Jan 2017 P. I-4, I-5. Web: [http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/new\\_pubs/jp3\\_0.pdf](http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/new_pubs/jp3_0.pdf)
53. Joint Publication 6-08, Interagency Cooperation. Vol. I. [Washington, D.C.]: Joint Chiefs of Staff, 2016. Web: [http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/new\\_pubs/jp3\\_08.pdf](http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/new_pubs/jp3_08.pdf)
54. Jones, James. *All Elements of National Power*. Atlantic Council. 2014. Web: [https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/images/publications/All\\_Elements\\_of\\_National\\_Power.pdf](https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/images/publications/All_Elements_of_National_Power.pdf)
55. Jordan, Taylor, Mazarr; *American National Security*. Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999.
56. Kaiser, Frederick and Halchin, Elaine. "Congressional Oversight of Intelligence: Current Structure and Alternatives." Congressional Research Service. May 2012. P. 4. Web: <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/intel/RL32525.pdf>
57. Kean, Thomas, et al. "9/11 Commission Report." 2004. P. XVI. Web: <https://www.9-11commission.gov/report/911Report.pdf>
58. King, Kay. "Congress and National Security." Council on Foreign Relations Press. 2010. Web: [https://www.cfr.org/sites/default/files/pdf/2010/11/Congress\\_CSR58.pdf](https://www.cfr.org/sites/default/files/pdf/2010/11/Congress_CSR58.pdf)
59. Kozloski, Robert. *The Information Domain as an Element of National Power*. Center for Contemporary Conflict, Naval Post Graduate School. 2009. Web: <https://www.hsdl.org/?view&did=232244>
60. Kugler, Richard. *Policy Analysis in National Security Affairs*. National Defense University Press; 2006. Web: <https://ndupress.ndu.edu/Media/News/Article/1216779/policy-analysis-in-national-security-affairs-new-methods-for-a-new-era/>

61. Leonard J. De Francisci. *Employing the Economic Instrument of National Power in Unstable Areas*. Small Wars Journal. 2011. Web.  
<http://smallwarsjournal.com/sites/default/files/874-defrancisci.pdf>
62. Leszek, Walter J. *Congressional Procedures and the Policy Process*. CQ Press, Eighth Edition. 2011.
63. Lowenthal, Mark. *Intelligence, From Secrets to Policy*. Sage Press, 2015.
64. Lucas, Nathan; McInnis, Kathleen. "The 2015 National Security Strategy: Authorities, Changes, Issues for Congress." Congressional Research Service. April 2016. Web: <https://www.hsdl.org/?view&did=791843>
65. McCain, John. "SASC Chairman John McCain Remarks on Top Defense Priorities for 114th Congress at CSIS." Senate Armed Service Committee Press Release. March 2015. Web: <https://www.armed-services.senate.gov/press-releases/sasc-chairman-john-mccain-remarks-on-top-defense-priorities-for-114th-congress-at-csis>
66. McInnis, Cathlene. "*Right-Sizing*" the National Security Council Staff" CRS Insight, 2016. Web: <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/IN10521.pdf>
67. Meese, Edwin, "Who Is Responsible for America's Security?" The Heritage Foundation. 2011. Web. <http://www.heritage.org/the-constitution/report/who-responsible-americas-security>
68. Morgenstern, Emily. Department of State and Foreign Operations Appropriations: History of Legislation and Funding in Brief. Congressional Research Service. 2019. P. 8. Web: <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R44637.pdf>
69. Nagata, Michael, Abbas, Ali; et al. Multi-Method Assessment of ISIL. Strategic Multilayer Assessment (SMA) Periodic Publication. 2014. Web: [http://socialscience.net/docs/SMA\\_SOCCENT\\_White.Paper\\_Final\\_Dec2014.pdf](http://socialscience.net/docs/SMA_SOCCENT_White.Paper_Final_Dec2014.pdf)
70. National Defense University. "National Security Primer." The National War College. 2018. P. 10. Web: <https://nwc.ndu.edu/Portals/71/Documents/Publications/NSS-Primer-Final-Ed.pdf?ver=2018-07-26-140012-980>
71. National Priorities Project. "Budget Process: Federal Budget 101." Institute for Policy Studies. Web: <https://www.nationalpriorities.org/budget-basics/federal-budget-101/federal-budget-process/>

72. Negroponte, John D. *Annual Threat Assessment of the Director of National Intelligence for the Senate Armed Services Committee*. Director of National Intelligence. 28 February 2006. Web:  
[https://www.dni.gov/files/documents/Newsroom/Testimonies/20060228\\_testimony.pdf](https://www.dni.gov/files/documents/Newsroom/Testimonies/20060228_testimony.pdf)
73. Nuechterlein, Donald E. "United States National Interests in a Changing World." University Press of Kentucky, 2014. P. 6. ProQuest Ebook Central,  
<http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/jhu/detail.action?docID=1915860>.
74. Obama, Barack. "National Security Strategy." National Archives. February 2015. Web: <http://nssarchive.us/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/2015.pdf>
75. Oleszek, Walter J. *Congressional Procedures and the Policy Process*. CQ Press, Eighth Edition. 2011.
76. Ornstein, Norman J., and Thomas E. Mann. "When Congress Checks Out." *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 85, no. 6, 2006, JSTOR, [www.jstor.org/stable/20032144](http://www.jstor.org/stable/20032144).
77. Oscarson, Katerina. The Effectiveness of DIMEFIL Instruments of Power in the Gray Zone. NATO Open Publication. Volume 1, Number 2. 2017. Web:  
[https://www.academia.edu/32325460/The\\_Effectiveness\\_of\\_DIMEFIL\\_Instruments\\_of\\_Power\\_in\\_the\\_Gray\\_Zone](https://www.academia.edu/32325460/The_Effectiveness_of_DIMEFIL_Instruments_of_Power_in_the_Gray_Zone)
78. Pearl, Raphael. "U.S. Anti-Terror Strategy and the 9/11 Commission Report." Congressional Research Service. P. i. Web:  
<https://fas.org/sgp/crs/terror/RL32522.pdf>
79. Pendleton, John. *National Security: Key Challenges and Solutions to Strengthen Interagency Collaboration*. GAO Reports. 2010. Web:  
<https://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-10-822T>
80. Project on National Security Reform. "Preliminary Findings Report." The Center for the Study of the Presidency. 2008. P. 60 – 61. Web:  
<http://0183896.netsolhost.com/site/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/pnsr-preliminary-findings-july-2008.pdf>
81. Queen, Ira. *The Whole of Government Approach Demands Interagency Coordination*. Defense Institute of Security Assistance Management. The DISAM Annual. December 2015. Web:  
<http://connection.ebscohost.com/c/articles/112187044/whole-government-approach-demands-interagency-coordination>

82. Rollins, John & Wyler, Liana. *Terrorism and Transnational Crime: Foreign Policy Issues for Congress*. Congressional Research Service. 2013. Web: <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/terror/R41004.pdf>
83. Rosenbach, Eric & Peritz Aki J. "Congressional Oversight of the Intelligence Community." Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Harvard Kennedy School. 2009. Web: <https://www.belfercenter.org/publication/congressional-oversight-intelligence-community>
84. Rothkopf, David. *Running the World*. Public Affairs, Perseus Book Group; 2005.
85. Saturno, James; Tollestrup, Jessica. "Omnibus Appropriations Acts: Overview of Recent Practices." Congressional Research Service. Jan 2016. P. i. Web: <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RL32473.pdf>
86. Scudder, Sally. "Strategic Operational Planning and Congressional Oversight of Intelligence." National Defense University. Institute for National Strategic Studies. June 2012. Web. <https://inssblog.wordpress.com/2012/06/19/strategic-operational-planning-and-congressional-oversight-of-intelligence/>
87. Shellman, Stephen M.; Levey, Brian; Leonard Hans H. "Countering the Adversary: Effective Policies or a DIME a Dozen?" Violent Intranational Political Conflict and Terrorism (VIPCAT) Research Laboratory. College of William and Marry. 2011. Web: <http://strategicanalysisenterprises.com/papers/countering.adversary.hscb.apsa.pdf>
88. Schanzer, Eyerman, de Rugy. "Strategic Risk Management in Government: A Look at Homeland Security." IBM Center for the Business of Government. 2009. Web: [https://www.mercatus.org/system/files/Applying\\_Strategic\\_Risk\\_Management\\_to\\_Allocating\\_Resources\\_for\\_Homeland\\_Security.pdf](https://www.mercatus.org/system/files/Applying_Strategic_Risk_Management_to_Allocating_Resources_for_Homeland_Security.pdf).
89. SMARTbooks. "Instruments of National Power." Lightning Press. 2017. Web: <https://www.thelightningpress.com/the-instruments-of-national-power/>
90. Stojanosk, Oliver. *Review of The Process of Making Decisions in The US National Security Policy*. International Scientific Journal. Contemporary Macedonian Defense. 2016. Web: [https://web.b.ebscohost.com/abstract?direct=true&profile=ehost&scope=site&auth\\_type=crawler&jrnl=14098199&AN=117703177&h=LinAfwQ%2bulAhGLBbPxBG%2f6TMAJaySpza3n5C2Qv%2bf8LVXbtC6oioL6HMw%2b2NuP0DgF3hhe](https://web.b.ebscohost.com/abstract?direct=true&profile=ehost&scope=site&auth_type=crawler&jrnl=14098199&AN=117703177&h=LinAfwQ%2bulAhGLBbPxBG%2f6TMAJaySpza3n5C2Qv%2bf8LVXbtC6oioL6HMw%2b2NuP0DgF3hhe)

[vzbNYS9RNJuiqCw%3d%3d&crl=f&resultNs=AdminWebAuth&resultLocal=ErrCrlNoProfile&crlhashurl=login.aspx%3fdirect%3dtrue%26profile%3dehost%26scope%3dsite%26authtype%3dcrawler%26jrnl%3d14098199%26AN%3d117703177](http://vzbNYS9RNJuiqCw%3d%3d&crl=f&resultNs=AdminWebAuth&resultLocal=ErrCrlNoProfile&crlhashurl=login.aspx%3fdirect%3dtrue%26profile%3dehost%26scope%3dsite%26authtype%3dcrawler%26jrnl%3d14098199%26AN%3d117703177)

91. Stolberg, Alan. *How Nation-States Craft National Security Strategy Documents*. U.S. Army War College Strategic Studies Institute. 2012. Web  
<http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/pub1128.pdf>
92. Strand, Johnson and Climer. "Surviving Inside Congress." Congressional Institute Incorporated. Fifth Edition. 2015.
93. Towell, Pat. "Fact Sheet: Selected Highlights of the FY2016 Defense Budget Debate and the National Defense Authorization Act." Congressional Research Service. Dec 2015. Web: <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/R44019.pdf>
94. United State Government. U.S. Department of Justice. *FY 2015 Annual Performance Report & FY 2017 Annual Performance Plan*. Web:  
<https://www.justice.gov/doj/fy-2015-annual-performance-report-fy-2017-annual-performance-plan>
95. United States of America. Department of Defense. "A-Z List." 2017. Web:  
<https://www.defense.gov/About/Military-Departments/A-Z-List/>
96. United States of America. Department of Homeland Security. "Operational and Support Components." June 2017. Web: <https://www.dhs.gov/operational-and-support-components>
97. United States of America. Department of Justice. "Alphabetical Listing of Components, Programs, & Initiatives." June 2017. Web:  
<https://www.justice.gov/doj/alphabetical-listing-components-programs-initiatives>;
98. United States of America. Department of State. "Alphabetical List of Bureaus and Offices, 2017." Web: <https://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/rls/dos/1718.htm>
99. United States of America. "Homeland Security Act 2002." Department of Homeland Security. November 2002. Web:  
[https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/hr\\_5005\\_enr.pdf](https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/hr_5005_enr.pdf)
100. United States of America. House of Representatives. "House Resolution 449." June 2002. Web: <https://www.congress.gov/bill/107th-congress/house-resolution/449/text>



101. United States of America. House of Representatives, History, Art & Archives, “The Committee on Homeland Security,” 2017. Web:  
<http://history.house.gov/HistoricalHighlight/Detail/37117>
102. United States of America. “Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004.” Government Printing Office. December 2004. Web:  
<https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/PLAW-108publ458/pdf/PLAW-108publ458.pdf>
103. United States of America. Senate Committee on Homeland Security & Governmental Affairs. “History.” 2017. Web:  
<https://www.hsgac.senate.gov/about/history>
104. United States of America. United States Intelligence Community. “Member Agencies.” 2017. Web: <https://www.intelligencecareers.gov/icmembers.html>
105. US Department of Justice. The Drug Enforcement Administration’s International Operations. Office of the Inspector General Audit Division. Audit Report 07-19. 2007. P. i. Web: <https://oig.justice.gov/reports/DEA/a0719/final.pdf>
106. US Department of State. Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review. 2015. P. 8. Web: <https://www.state.gov/documents/organization/267396.pdf>
107. U.S. Department of Treasury. Organizational Structure, About. 2019. Web:  
<https://www.treasury.gov/about/organizational-structure/offices/Pages/Office-Of-International-Affairs.aspx>
108. U.S. *Field Manual 3-0, Operations*, 2008.
109. U.S. Government. *National Strategy for Combating Terrorism*. 2006. Web:  
<https://www.hsdl.org/?view&did=466588>
110. U.S. Government. *National Strategy for Combating Terrorism*. 2011. Web:  
<https://www.hsdl.org/?view&did=466588>
111. U.S. Government. *National Strategy for Combating Terrorism*. 2018. Web:  
<https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/NSCT.pdf>
112. U.S. Government. *National Strategy for Homeland Security*. 2007. Web:  
[https://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/nat\\_strat\\_homelandsecurity\\_2007.pdf](https://www.dhs.gov/xlibrary/assets/nat_strat_homelandsecurity_2007.pdf)
113. US. Government. *Presidential Policy Directive -1*. Office of the Whitehouse. 2009. Web: <https://fas.org/irp/offdocs/ppd/ppd-1.pdf>



114. U.S Government. *The National Military Strategy of the United States of America*. Joint Chiefs of Staff. 2015. Web: [https://www.jcs.mil/Portals/36/Documents/Publications/2015\\_National\\_Military\\_Strategy.pdf](https://www.jcs.mil/Portals/36/Documents/Publications/2015_National_Military_Strategy.pdf)
115. U.S Government. *National Economic Council (NEC)*. The Obama White House, Archives. 2016. Web: <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/administration/eop/nec>
116. U.S. Government. *NATIONAL SECURITY ACT OF 1947, § Chapter 343-101 (1947)*. Print. Web: <https://www.dni.gov/index.php/ic-legal-reference-book/national-security-act-of-1947>
117. U.S Government. *Fact Sheet: The 2015 National Security Strategy*. Office of the Press Secretary White House, 2015. Web. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2015/02/06/fact-sheet-2015-national-security-strategy>
118. U.S. Government. *National Security Strategy*. Office of the President. 2015. Web. [https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/2015\\_national\\_security\\_strategy\\_2.pdf](https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/2015_national_security_strategy_2.pdf)
119. U.S. Government. *National Security Strategy*. Office of the President. 2017. Web: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/NSS-Final-12-18-2017-0905.pdf>
120. U.S. Government. *2015 Agency Financial Report*. US Department of State. 2015. Web. <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/249770.pdf>
121. Vinik, Danny. “Meet your Unauthorized Federal Government.” The Agenda. Politico. February 3, 2016. Web: <https://www.politico.com/agenda/story/2016/02/government-agencies-programs-unauthorized-000036-000037>
122. Viotti, Paul. “The Dollar and National Security.” Stanford University Press. 2014.
123. Wilcox, Mark. *The National Security Council Deputies Committee Engine of the Policy Process*. InterAgency Journal Vol. 5, Issue 1. 2014 Web: <http://thesimonscenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/IAJ-5-1Winter-2014-22-32.pdf>

124. Worley, Robert. *Orchestrating the Instruments of Power*. Potomac Books. 2015.
125. Zarate, Juan. *Treasury's War*. Public Affairs New York. 2013

Andrew H. Armstrong was born in Scottsdale, Arizona and is an Officer in the United States Marine Corps. He earned his B.A. from the University of Massachusetts, Amherst in 2002. He commissioned in the United State Marine Corps in 2004. He is a graduate of Expeditionary Warfare School and Command and Staff College. He has multiple deployments throughout the globe with experience in operational planning.